DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 196 32 TM 006 571

TITLE	National Institute of Education National Survey: Follow-up Study of Non-Instructional Auxiliary Services ESEA Title I.
INSTITUTION	National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jul 77
CONTRACT	400-76-0124
NOTE	293p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$15.39 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Community Services; *Compensatory Education Programs; Disadvantaged Schools; Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Secondary Education; *Follow Up Studies; Guidance Services; Low Achievers; *National Surveys; Needs Assessment; Program Administration; *Program Evaluation; Psychological Services; *Pupil Personnel Services; Resource Centers; School Districts; School Health Services; Social Services; Speech Therapy
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

Eighteen case studies which supplement the National Survey of Compensatory Education are presented. This survey evaluated Title I-funded special services to low achieving students in poor schools, and was conducted by the National Institute of Education. The case studies describe health, guidance, psychological social work, and other noninstructional services offered in 18 selected school districts. The percentage of Title I funding, selection criteria, district rationales, and the variance in the level of services from 1973-74 through 1976-77 are discussed. (Author/HV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146196

IM006 521

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM UD
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

NATIONAL SURVEY

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF NON-INSTRUCTIONAL AUXILIARY SERVICES ESEA TITLE I

CONTRACT No. 400-76-0124
NORC PROJECT No. 4245

JULY, 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NORC
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

INTRODUCTION TO THE CASE STUDIES

In the Education Amendments of 1974 (Public Law 93-380), Congress directed the National Institute of Education (NIE) to conduct a study of compensatory education programs financed by individual States and by the Federal Government under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Under Title I, the largest Federal education effort, Congress made funds available to improve educational programs for low-achieving students in school districts serving children from low-income families. In its study of compensatory education programs NIE was instructed to:

- -- examine the fundamental purposes and effectiveness of such programs
- -- analyze the ways of identifying children in greatest need of compensatory education
- -- consider alternative ways of meeting these children's needs
- -- consider the feasibility, costs, and consequences of alternative means of distributing Federal compensatory education funds

On the basis of its study NIE was to provide recommendations on the range of possible objectives, funding methods, administrative techniques, and

educational programs to assist Congress in its deliberations on the future of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

To carry out this mandate, NIE first undertook a careful review of the provisions of Title I and its amendments and the accompanying House and Senate reports and Congressional debates. On the basis of this review NIE identified three fundamental purposes for Title I:

-- to provide financial assistance to school districts in relation to their numbers of low-income children and, within those school districts, to schools with the greatest numbers of low-income students

-- to fund special services for low-achieving children in the poorest schools

-- to contribute to the cognitive, emotional, social, or physical development of participating students

NIE then initiated a series of research projects designed to provide clear information about how existing Title I programs serve each of these fundamental purposes and to examine the feasibility of alternative ways of administering Title I.

The National Survey of Compensatory Education is the major data collection effort through which NIE is examining Title I's achievement of the second purpose noted above, that of providing special services to selected children. Because relatively little was known about the non-instructional services offered by school districts as part of their Title I programs, NIE decided to supplement the primary study with a series of case studies designed to gather further descriptive information on these auxiliary (supportive or ancillary) Title I services. The case

studies, submitted with this report, describe the kinds of services being offered in selected districts, how children are chosen to receive these services, districts' rationales for providing such services, and how the level at which these services have been provided during the school years from 1973-74 through 1976-77 has varied. The studies are based on interviews conducted between late February and mid-May, 1977, in eighteen school districts that offer ESEA Title I instructional programs.

A. The Sample

The districts selected for the study are a subsample of the districts that participated in the National Survey of Compensatory Education. On the basis of limited information for the 1975-76 school year available from the earlier survey, the districts in that sample were divided into three groups according to patterns of expenditure for Title I auxiliary services. The first group included the districts that expended Title I funds for a single auxiliary service (high concentration of expenditures); the second group included the districts that expended funds for two or more services (low concentration of expenditures); and the third group included the districts identified as having no Title I auxiliary services (no concentration). Six districts in each group were selected for the present study.

The numbering of the case studies follows from the selection process: case studies numbered 1 through 6 are for the districts selected as having a high concentration of services; numbers 7 through 12 are the low concentration districts; and numbers 13 through 18 are the 'no concentration' districts. As the case studies show, however, the programs actually offered in some districts

do not reflect the criterion on which those districts were selected. For some districts our information on auxiliary services was incomplete or inaccurate: three of the six districts selected as having no auxiliary services were found to have at least a small auxiliary service component in their Title I programs. For other districts, the year on which our sampling was based, 1975-76, was an atypical year, one in which the districts' programs differed significantly from those of previous and succeeding years.

The selection based on expenditures for auxiliary services during the 1975-76 school year provided cases ranging widely in geographical location and size. Seven of the nine Census regions of the country were represented in the sample, with the following distribution:

Region	# of Cases
New England	3
Middle Atlantic	2
East North Central	5
West North Central	0
South Atlantic	3
East South Central	2
West South Central	1
Mountain	0
Pacific	2

The figure on the following page provides further information on the sample. In the figure the cases are ranked according to the population of the area served by the school districts. The "Selection Criterion" indicates the characteristic for which the district was originally selected for the study. The third column in the figure provides a rough indication of the nature of the district, i.e., whether it serves a primarily urban, suburban, or rural area. The remaining columns summarize the auxiliary services offered in the districts

SAMPLE SUMMARY

CASE # (by population)	SELECTION CRITERION*	URBAN/ RURAL	1973-74 # SERVICES	1973-74 % T-1 BUDGET FOR SERVICES	1976-77 # SERVICES	1976-77 % T-1 BUDGET FOR SERVICES
A. 150,000 OR MORE						
12	2	urban	9	11.2[1]	9	11.6[2]
13	3	urban	2	.3	2	1.1
14	3	urban	4	5.8	1	1.4
8	2	urban	5	16.7	4	6.9
7	2	urban	7/0[3]	6.4/0	2	2.0
10	2	rural	5	7.7	4	8.3
B. 50,000 - 150,000						
11	2	urban	2	12.4	3	8.1
5	1	urban	1	.3	1	.3
2	1	suburban	4	25.9	3	15.7
3	1	urban	1	13.0(est.)	1	21.6
4	1	urban	4	7.7	2	3.8
C. 50,000 OR LESS						
9	2	rural	4	20.3	5	21.1
1	1	rural	1	6.6	1	6.5
15	3	urban	2	17.7	2	11.6
6	1	suburban/ rural	1	12.3	1	6.6
16	3	suburban/ rural	0	0.0	0	0.0
17	3	rural	1	65.6[4]	0	0.0
18	3	suburban	3	0.0	0	0.0

* SELECTION CRITERION: 1 = high concentration of auxiliary services (1 service)
2 = low concentration of auxiliary services (more than 1 service)
3 = no concentration of auxiliary services (no services)

NOTES:

[1] figure is for 1974-75; 73-74 figure not available

[2] figure is for 1975-76; 76-77 figure not available

[3] two districts in 1973-74 consolidated by 1976-77

[4] figure reflects a combined auxiliary service/instructional program

during the first and last years covered by the study (1973-74 and 1976-77). For each year, the first number represents the number of services or types of services offered; the second represents the percentage of the district's Title I budget that was spent for auxiliary services.

B. The Interviews

The interviews consisted of two main parts. During the first part the interviewer collected general factual information on the district's size (number of schools, number of students), the extent of its Title I program (number of schools and of students participating, total Title I allocation), and the auxiliary services offered as part of its Title I program (types of services, total budget for each, and the number of students receiving each service). This information was gathered for each of the four school years from 1973-74 to 1976-77. The interviewer then collected further information on a selection of the district's auxiliary services (number of schools offering the service, major budget categories, personnel providing the service and their major duties); this information was to be used as the basis for a more detailed discussion of these services during the second part of the interview.

To insure that the case studies provided descriptions of a broad range of services, the interviewers were to select services for further study on the following criteria. In districts were selection was possible, they were to obtain information first on the district's largest services, and second on services the district had offered in the past but was no longer offering. (For districts offering no auxiliary services, interviewers were to probe during the second part of the interview for a third category of services, those for which the district recognized a need but had not provided.) If further selection were possible, interviewers were to select services so that the final case studies

would include four descriptions of each of the major services (health, guidance and psychological services, and social work), descriptions of as many library/resource centers as possible, and descriptions of one or more of each of the other categories of services (food, transportation, community services, and 'other'). Similar but smaller quotas were established for services that districts had offered in the past but had dropped from their Title I programs. With one major exception -- the interviewers obtained information on only two districts currently providing a Title I library/resource center -- these quotas were met during the field period.

In providing information for this first part of the interview, respondents relied most frequently on their districts' Title I applications from prior years; in some cases they also referred to evaluations of past years' programs. On the basis of advance letters sent to respondents to confirm appointments and explain the interview, several districts had prepared summaries of the pertinent information before the interview began. Since the major purpose of this first part of the interview was to obtain a general picture of the district and its auxiliary service programs that could be used to direct discussion during the second part, interviewers accepted approximations or estimates when exact figures were not readily available.

The second part of the interview was essentially a conversation between the interviewer and the respondent about the district's auxiliary service programs. During these conversations, all but two of which were tape recorded, the interviewer and respondent discussed both the overall planning for the district's Title I program and the operation of the specific auxiliary services selected during the first part of the interview. Interviewers were provided only with a general outline of the major topics to be covered during the conversation and were allowed considerable freedom to pursue those aspects of a district's program with which

the district had encountered problems or experienced pressures for change and about which the respondent was best informed.

The conversations covered such topics as the district's needs assessment for its auxiliary services, how the services were actually provided to students, the goals of the services, the district's evaluation of its services, and alternative service programs available in the district. The major focus of the discussions, however, was on the changes that had taken place in the district's auxiliary services during the four year period, the factors influencing those changes, the process through which the district had decided to effect them, and the impact of the changes. The conversations concluded with a general discussion of the district's hopes and expectations for the future of its Title I auxiliary services and the likely impact on the district's services were Title I to become an exclusively instructional program.

The duration of the interviews varied considerably, depending on the facility with which the respondent could provide the basic factual information, the complexity of the district's programs, and the length of time the respondent could make himself available. The majority of the interviews took between three and five hours to complete.

C. The Respondents

The content of the interview dictated that the respondent be someone knowledgeable about the district's overall Title I program, preferably someone who had been in a position to observe or to participate in decisions affecting the program and who had served in the district throughout the four years studied. We therefore selected as respondents persons with supervisory or administrative responsibility for the district's Title I program; in most cases this was the district's Title I director or coordinator for federal and/or state funded programs.

In most districts, moreover, the interviews were restricted to this single respondent. The time allowed by the relatively limited scope of the project precluded the extensive interviewing that would have been necessary to evaluate the various programs or to provide a basis for interpreting the possibly conflicting views of different respondents. And, since the districts participating in the study had previously given considerable time to earlier studies of their Title I programs, for this study we sought to make as few demands on their cooperation as possible. In preparing for the interviews, therefore, we asked each district to designate a single person knowledgeable about the district's program; in all cases we were referred to someone with major responsibility for planning the district's Title I program. In several districts the primary respondent was joined for the interview by one or more other persons associated with the Title I program, and in a few sites time did allow for supplementary interviews with respondents having knowledge about particular aspects of the district's program.

D. The Case Studies

The interviews were conducted by staff personnel from NORC's Field Operations Branch rather than by regular field interviewers. Each interviewer assumed primary responsibility for preparing the reports on the districts he visited. The reports are based on notes taken particularly during the first part of the interviews and, for all but two of the case studies, on tape recordings made during the second part. In a few instances material collected during the interview was supplemented by reference to materials that the districts had made available in preparation for the earlier study of Title I instructional programs.

These case studies will be of greatest use to a reader who wishes a general picture of the kinds of auxiliary or supportive services school districts have been offering as part of their Title I programs, how districts go about planning for their auxiliary services, and the typical problems and pressures for change they have had to confront in maintaining their programs. During the interviews we asked for, and the respondents helpfully provided, not only a great deal of essentially factual information, but also a variety of opinions, impressions, and judgments about their auxiliary service programs and about their Title I programs in general. In the case studies we have sought simply to present an accurate and straightforward report of these respondents' descriptions and evaluations of their programs.

Inevitably, in some matters the respondents' knowledge was incomplete; for other matters time did not allow full discussion. And while for convenience we have often reported the impressions of a single respondent as representative of "the district's" position, it should be noted that such views sometimes represent informally offered personal opinions rather than 'official' district positions. Within the limited scope of the study, moreover, we have made no attempt to judge the accuracy of respondents' descriptions of their programs or to arrive at independent evaluations either of the effectiveness of the programs or of their compliance with Title I guidelines.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 1

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

III. DESCRIPTION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

B. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

C. Program Decision-Making

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

This district serves a largely rural county with a population of approximately 35,000. The interview was conducted in the county seat, a town of about 14,000. The population in the area is predominantly white and approximately 25 percent of the students in the district's schools are from low-income families. Enrollment in the district's fourteen public schools has remained near 8,000 throughout the four years covered by this study. A small number of children residing in the district attendance area attend a non-public boarding school in the district, but this school does not participate in Title I programs and is not treated further in this study.

The district selects its eligible Title I schools on the basis of a survey of family incomes conducted through the schools, but expects to begin using free lunch counts in the future. Schools where the incidence of economic deprivation exceeds the district average are eligible for Title I. State guidelines requiring that Title I programs be limited to kindergarten through sixth grade and the district's decision (based on state recommendations) to concentrate its services have led the district to reduce the number of schools offering Title I programs from ten in 1973-74 to eight in 1974-75 and to 6 for the 1975-76 and 1976-77 school years. Most of the schools cut were at the junior high level, but there is one small elementary school that is eligible but not participating in Title I. With this reduction in the number of schools served, the number of students participating in Title I programs has fallen from almost 1,500 in 1973-74 to about 800 for the current year.

The students' eligibility is determined by scores on standardized tests and the evaluations and recommendations of teachers and principals. Almost all of the eligible students in the six target schools participate in Title I instructional programs. During the four-year period covered by the study, the district has offered only one supportive service, guidance counseling, in two of its Title I schools. The service has accounted for 6-8 percent of the total Title I budget.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

Since the 1973-74 school year there have been no major changes in the guidance counseling program offered in the district. Although the district has reduced the overall size of its Title I program to focus on children in kindergarten through the sixth grades, the scope of the guidance service has not changed. During each of the four years the service has been offered to about 150 children in the same two Title I schools. The slight changes from year to year in the program's budget reflect annual salary increases.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

The guidance counseling service is provided by two certified counselors who work under the supervision of the principals of the two schools at which they are stationed. One serves full-time in an elementary school located near a federal housing project; the other serves a school which has both junior high and elementary students, spending 50 percent of his time with the junior high students and the other 50 percent with the Title I elementary students. Title I funds pay for half of this counselor's salary.

Although both of the schools with counselors have a high concentration of economically disadvantaged students, several other schools in the district have equal or greater concentrations. These two schools were chosen on the basis of the district's assessment of the "community situation" around them and its judgment that the children in these areas were particularly in need of the home-visitation services of the counselors. The federal housing project was a major factor in the selection of the school for the full-time counselor. Since the Title I budget could only pay for an additional half-time counselor, the district's willingness to pick up the other half of the counselor's salary was an additional reason for providing Title I counseling services to the elementary students in the combined elementary-junior high school.

The district provides some counseling services in the secondary schools through state and local funds, but there are no counselors other than the Title I counselors in the elementary schools. The district began its Title I counseling program some eight or nine years ago, most probably, according to the respondent, on the initiative of the former director of the Title I program; the respondent had no other information on the beginnings of the program.

The counseling service is provided to children in the two schools who are eligible for, and, with few exceptions, participating in Title I instructional activities. In the fall of each school year the district makes a special effort to identify the students who might need the services of the counselor. The counselor reviews the test scores of the Title I students in his school and consults with the teachers and principals who are most familiar with the students. Some children with severe emotional or physical handicaps are referred for extensive diagnostic testing, which

is provided by the staff from a local college. If, on the basis of these tests, the child is certified for the district's special education program, he will receive services from that program and will not participate in Title I. Children with less severe problems, whether identified at the beginning of the school year or referred by Title I teachers or principals during the course of the year, will receive the services of the Title I counselors.

The services provided through the program include both the testing and the direct student contact normally associated with the work of a counselor, and home-visitation and referral work often associated with the duties of a social worker. (The respondent mentioned at one point that in filling out his proposal from year to year he is sometimes tempted to treat the program as social work rather than counseling.) The counselors spend about two/thirds of their time at the schools they serve, observing children's behavior in the classroom, working with individuals or small groups in direct counseling, and in game- and role-playing activities designed to help the children improve their attitudes toward school and to overcome emotional or behavioral problems. Some of these children will be seen by the counselor on a regular basis throughout the school year; others will be seen over a limited term of a month or less. In the remaining third of their time the counselors do some testing to diagnose the learning disabilities of Title I children referred to them by the Title I reading teachers. They also spend some of this time visiting parents in their homes, explaining how the Title I program is trying to help the child and what the parents can do to help. The counselors also discuss attendance problems, arrange referrals for specialized assistance (local civic organizations, for example, will provide free vision testing), and, in general, seek to increase the parents' involvement in their children's activities at school.

The counselors coordinate their work to some extent with local social service agencies, e.g., the county social workers; there is some exchange of information but this is limited by considerations of confidentiality.

As for other teachers in the district, the basic salary of the counselors provides for ten days in-service training during the year. Training for the counselors includes attendance at local Title I workshops and at regional conferences for guidance personnel.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The supportive service component of the district's Title I program has two main goals: to provide specific help through the services of trained and knowledgeable counselors to children whose social and emctional problems hinder their participation in the school's instructional activities; and to educate and involve parents in the activities of the schools.

B. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

In assessing the need for its Title I program the district reviews the poverty data collected to determine its eligible schools and the test scores used to select eligible students. The district's Title I director consults with the counselors and with the teachers and principals in the Title I schools to tap their extensive knowledge of the community, of the schools, and of the progress, background, and problems of the students in those schools. Parents are consulted in informal discussions and, more importantly, through the meetings of the advisory councils at the individual Title I schools and the district-wide council. Determination of the continuing need for the counseling service is based primarily on the district's experience in working with Title I children and its understanding of the frequent connection between a child's academic problems and problems in his home

situation. Though the district sees a need for counseling in all of its Title I schools, it has chosen to serve the two schools where the home-visitation services of the counselors can be most useful.

In evaluating its counseling program the district relies on written descriptions of services given and of improvements effected by those services (these form part of the annual evaluation) and on discussions with the counselors, teachers, and parents of the children who have been served.

Though it has no statistical measures of the success of the counselors' activities, the district believes that the children are being helped by the services and that the counselors are doing a good job. The respondent noted that the principals in particular are strongly supportive of the counseling program and that he has received numerous requests to extend the service from the principals of schools that do not have counselors. Although no one has complained about the service itself, there have been some complaints that the service is limited to two schools. Perhaps one indication of the value the district sees in the service is that in years when Title I funding has been tight (as in 1974 when the district's allocation fell by about $30,000), the district has chosen to cut teacher aides from its reading program rather than eliminate the counselors.

In the course of the interview the respondent mentioned that the district Title I program had recently undergone a federal audit and that no problems had been noted in its supportive service program.

C. Program Planning and Decision-Making

The detailed planning for the district's Title I program--the writing of the district's proposal--is done primarily by the Title I Director and the Superintendent. Title I parents are not formally involved in the actual preparation of the proposal because the proposal is usually not completed until the summer months, when the parent councils do not meet.

However, the Title I director and the superintendent base their decisions on extensive consultations with Title I parents, teachers, and counselors, which are held earlier in the year. During the planning process the district also receives a visit from a state Title I field representative who reviews the district's proposal, explains guidelines, and offers suggestions.

Each of the district's Title I schools now has its own parent council which is in turn represented in the district-wide council. At the various meetings of the parent councils (which, to improve parent attendance, are sometimes held just prior to PTA meetings), district representatives will explain the Title I program and solicit suggestions and recommendations.

> We let them know what we're doing and what we have planned; what is available, what the guidelines are, and what directions we can go in. And we ask: 'What would you recommend or suggest? Tell us what you think we should do.'

The parents tend to make two sorts of suggestions. They may recommend an increase in instructional or supportive services or suggest a greater focus on a particular instructional technique or approach, such as providing more instruction in the classroom or, conversely, providing more instruction outside the classroom. In general, however, the parents are in agreement with the district's Title I program:

> What we're doing is pretty close to their recommendations; we both want to do the same thing. Our goals are the same. When we have meetings, the parents will say: 'That's just fine. That's what I'd like for you to do,' or 'I believe you're going in the right direction.' I think they're all aware that it's the reading and math that the children need. . . And as long as we stay in this field where they feel their child needs most help, they're very agreeable and I've had very little criticism on the areas we're working in.

Wherever possible, the district attempts to act on the parents' suggestions:

> In a lot of cases they haven't had the training and experience to know all the avenues of learning and so forth. But still, I think you need their input. If something can be done in different ways effectively, I usually try to go with their suggestions.

The parents support the district's counseling program and would like to see it extended to other Title I schools, "but they understand the money problem" and now instead of asking why the program can't be extended they ask "when can we get the counselors?"

> We would like to have a guidance person in each of our six schools, but we just have so much money and we have to make a decision on whether to have a reading teacher or to have a guidance person.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It's a hard decision to make. . . We look at these standard test scores, and we talk with the classroom teachers about the need for remedial work in reading or in math and see the number we have in this area. . and then we start thinking that . . . maybe the reason why they aren't reading is the home situation. And then I ask which would be the best, to have a reading teacher to work with them when they get to school and teach them basics, maybe in reading, or should I get a guidance person or a person to visit the home? So I have to make a decision. In each of my schools I have reading teachers, and then as far as the funds will go, I supplement this with my guidance persons.

Parents do offer criticism, however. Their criticism is primarily directed at the reductions in the Title I program or at its limits. In accordance with the state's directive, the district discontinued the Title I instructional programs in the junior highs. In its own moves toward concentration, the district has further limited the number of elementary schools participating in Title I. Though the number of students needing assistance remains largely unchanged, "we're trying to concentrate and do a more thorough job with those we do work with--fewer students and fewer schools." The parents from the schools where programs have been cut were "sorry to see" the cuts, "but after we explained the situation, they could see the need for it." Other complaints come from parents of children in non-Title I schools where there are students whose individual need for Title I services is as great as that of students in the participating schools, but where the concentration

of need is insufficient to qualify the school for Title I. "These students may be few in number, but they're there, and we can't touch them because they aren't in an eligible school."

The state has encouraged the district's concentration of its programs. It also encourages the district to spend the majority of its money on instructional services, but it has not issued any specific guidelines on how much the district may spend on supportive as opposed to instructional services. Nor has the state ever turned down any items requested by the district in its proposal.

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

The district sees its counseling program as a limited, but important part of its Title I program, ranking second in priority only to the basic reading instructional services. It believes that the counselors are doing a good job in providing a valuable service, particularly through their work to improve the parents' understanding of the program and increase their involvement in Title I activities. Asked about weak points in the program the respondent pointed only to the need for additional personnel to provide counseling in the remaining four Title I schools. Since, in recent years, most of the district's Title I funds have been used to maintain existing services, the district sees little possibility of extending the program at this time. Even with an increase in its Title I allocation, the district would have to consider adding more staff for math instruction before adding more counselors. The respondent could see no possibility of finding alternative sources of funding for its supportive service.

When asked about additional supportive services for which there is a need in the district, the respondent mentioned, in addition to guidance counselors for each of the Title I schools, a need for persons who could

combine the duties of community service and social workers, spending the bulk of their time doing home visits and working to improve parent involvement. As a further need he mentioned health services, noting that the district does not currently provide such services (though local civic organizations do provide free sight and hearing screenings). On many occasions the district has discussed the possibility of adding new services, but because of the limited Title I funds available, it has not been able to get beyond simply discussing the needs and the services that might meet them. As noted previously, several principals have been particularly anxious to obtain counselors for their schools, but, since they understand the money situation, they have not gone beyond keeping the Title I director aware of their requests.

In a short discussion of the changes he would like to see effected in Title I, the respondent placed greatest emphasis on being able to serve economically and educationally disadvantaged children in the non-Title I schools.

> The biggest thing is, I wish we could get into all the schools and work with the children,--the same type of child as far as educational disadvantage is concerned-- . . . and not have to select the schools. There may not be as many as in the Title I schools, but they need it just as badly.

A second change mentioned is a reduction in the paperwork associated with Title I programs. "I'm sure it could be cut down some. The major portion of my time is with paperwork. I think I could be more effective and contribute more to the actual things we're trying to do, to help the child, . . . if I could get out with that teacher rather than sitting here at this desk writing up forms." One specific help in this direction would be the full implementation of proposals for forward funding. This year, as in the past, the district was basing its proposal on a tentative allocation figure,

which meant that when the final allocation figure was available the basic proposal would probably have to be amended--and more forms prepared.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY #2

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

- A. 1973-74
- B. 1974-75
- C. 1975-76
- D. 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

- A. Team Approach to Supportive Services
- B. Guidance and Psychological
- C. Social Work
- D. Speech Therapy
- E. Library/Resource Center

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Goals
- B. Decision-Making Process
- C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS, AND FUTURE PLANS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

The district is an aging suburb with a population of 73,000. As one respondent explained it, "Within the past ten years the community has experienced phenomena common to many cities--a declining tax base, an influx of minority groups, an outflow of the white middle-class, and a corresponding increase in the poverty level of the municipality." Approximately 11,000 students are enrolled in the 14 public schools in the district, while 7 non-public schools account for an additional 1500 students. Approximately two-thirds of the total school enrollment is black; whites, Orientals, and Hispanics account for the rest of the student population. These numbers have remained constant during the four-year period studied.

Prior to 1974-75, the district used AFDC counts as the basis for selecting its Title I eligible schools. As a result of the 1974 amendments to ESEA, the district has since used a combination of factors in determining Title I eligibility, including data from the 1970 Census, AFDC, the Free School Lunch Program, the numbers of foster children in the schools, and a school survey, as well as statistics from the county and city social services. Those schools whose percentage of economically disadvantaged students falls above the average for the district are eligible for Title I services; in 1975-76, the qualifying percentage was 28 percent. During each of the four years studied, 9 public schools and 3 non-public schools qualified. Together these 12 schools account for approximately 80 percent of the total district enrollment.

Supportive service personnel and programs are offered in all of the 12 Title I schools. Between 1973 and 1977, the district has offered four supportive service programs in speech therapy, guidance and psychology, social work, and a library/resource center. At one time the district also

had an early intervention program which operated a child development center for pre-kindergarten children. This center and the library/resource program were dropped at the end of the 1974-75 and 1975-76 school years, respectively. All other programs are still in operation. The grades covered by the programs have ranged from pre-kindergarten to ninth grade in 1973-74 to kindergarten through seventh in 1976-77. Throughout the study period the district has focused its Title I program on early intervention in grades pre-kindergarten through 3. No summer programs are offered in any of the Title I schools. In addition to these Title I programs, there are locally funded programs in health, speech therapy, and guidance and psychology in operation in all public schools, but no supportive service programs other than those offered by Title I are offered in the non-public schools.

The supportive service programs in the district were first begun in the 1966-67 school year. The primary impetus for these programs came from the district PAC, who made "very strong recommendations and repeatedly urged us to start providing supportive services under Title I. The district personnel, including the principals and staff of the local schools, knew of the need for these programs, and supported the recommendations of the PAC. But the original push came from the PAC."

All students who take part in the Title I instructional program are eligible to participate in supportive service programs. However, because the district desires to offer some supportive services in all Title I schools and yet needs to concentrate those services so that they remain effective, the district has had to target only the most needy Title I students for supportive services. As Title I allocations and personnel have declined, the targeting has become increasingly restrictive. These cuts in Title I funds, amounting to 30 percent between Fiscal Year 74 and Fiscal Year 77, and a state-initiated policy which resulted in curtailment of the child development

center, have brought about the most striking changes in supportive service programs during the period studied. The cutback in funds has affected both instructional and supportive services, but supportive service programs have borne the brunt. For instance, the number of supportive services personnel has declined by 75 percent over the four years. Correspondingly, in 1973-74, 1,000 students received some sort of supportive service; in 1976-77 the number has declined by almost 80 percent to 217 students. Contrasted with these cuts in funds and services, the number of Title I eligible students has risen by 300 students or 13 percent.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74

During the 1973-74 school year, the district provided supportive services in four areas: guidance and psychology, social work, speech therapy, and library/resource center. This was the second year that these services were coordinated through a team approach, whereby supportive service and instructional personnel regularly conferred on the needs, treatment plans, and progress of participating children. Nine public and three non-public schools offered these services in grades kindergarten through 9. In addition, the district also provided the same supportive services to pre-kindergarten children enrolled in the Title I supported child development center, an integral part of the district's focus on early intervention. Eighteen FTE service workers were involved in these programs.

B. 1974-75

This year was a boom year for the district's Title I funding. As a result of the availability of monies which had been impounded by the

Nixon administration, the district's total allocation increased by $300,000. Most of this additional money was channeled into the instructional program, but there were some slight increases in the budget for supportive services as well.

The district continued to provide all four supportive services in the 12 schools which qualified for Title I, and the child development center continued to provide supportive services for pre-kindergarten children. However, during this year the district received notification from the state of a new policy which affected the continuation of the center. The state instituted guidelines specifying that if the district could not demonstrate that all eligible Title I children above pre-kindergarten were receiving adequate services in reading, math, and English as a second language, the district could not use Title I funds to support a pre-kindergarten program. The respondents explained that they "in conscience could not provide such assurance" and, consequently, this was the last year the child development center was in operation.

There was also a comparability problem which resulted from the provision from local funds of many of the same services offered by Title I. The solution (implemented this year) was an agreement worked out with the state. It specified case loads for psychologists and speech therapists whose salaries are paid half by Title I and half by local funds. Under the agreement, each psychologist and speech therapist spend 50 percent of his time with Title I children and 50 percent in local budget funded programs. However, the psychologists' Title I caseloads are approximately one-third less than their local budget case loads. This arrangement guaranteed that Title I children would receive more intensive psychological services than those provided through local funds. Likewise, the caseload for speech therapists is such that they can devote more than

twice as much time to their Title I children as to the others. A full-time speech therapist under Title I may see 25 Title I children compared to 60 non Title I children under local funding.

In addition to avoiding supplanting and assuring comparability, this arrangement also allowed for continuity in the provision of psychological services to all children. Previously there had been problems with Title I psychologists being at schools only on an occasional basis in order to meet comparability requirements. Under this agreement, however, the psychologist would be at a school in the course of either Title I or local budget duties for a longer period of time and could be available to work with Title I children as the need arose.

C. 1975-76

During 1975-76, the district continued to offer supportive services in all four areas in all 12 schools. However, the scope of these services was greatly reduced as a result of funding cuts and loss of the child development center. Because of the introduction of the Orshansky index for determining eligiblity and the ceiling placed upon statewide average per-pupil expenditures, the district's total allocation under Title I was reduced to $940,000--a reduction of $200,000 from the 1973-74 allocation and of almost $500,000 from the 1974-75 allocation (which had been augmented by the release of impounded funds). ("The state got killed by this ceiling. It lost millions of dollars in Title I funds that year, and, of course, we felt that cut here at the district level.")

This reduction was borne largely by supportive service programs. The total number of personnel in supportive services and the number of students receiving supportive services declined by more than half from the preceding year, even though the number of children eligible for such

services remained the same. The area affected most by these cuts was the social work budget; it was cut by 65 percent, in accordance with the priorities set for the Title I program by the district.

D. 1976-77

The level of available funds continued to decline this year, now down another $100,000, or over $300,000 from the total allocation of 1973-74. As in the preceding year, supportive services were most severely cut back. The library/resource center was discontinued upon the retirement of the Title I librarian at the end of 1975-76, and the social work program was reduced to approximately one-seventh of its 1973-74 budget. There was a slight increase in the guidance and psychology budget, but that was offset by a slight decrease in the speech clinic budget. Overall, there are now only 4 FTE supportive service workers to service the 12 schools, compared with 18 FTE workers in 1973-74. However, the district has decided to continue providing services at all 12 eligible schools rather than targeting a smaller number of schools for concentrated services. The only move to concentration has been to limit the social work program to 2 schools, and, of course, to limit the total number of students receiving supportive services. This year only 217 students are receiving supportive services compared with 1,000 in 1973-74.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

A. Team approach to supportive services

Beginning with the 1972-73 school year, the district implemented a comprehensive team approach to the provision of Title I supportive services. Each Title I school has its own team which is made up of locally-funded

instructional and supportive service personnel (an administrator, a school nurse, classroom teachers, gym and art teachers) as well as Title I personnel assigned to that school (including a social worker; a learning disability specialist; reading and math specialists; a speech, hearing, and language clinician; a media center representative, and a psychologist). Working together as a team with the psychologist serving as team leader, this group first identifies those children in the Title I schools who, on the basis of test scores, are eligible for Title I instructional services. From this group, the team then selects those students for participation in the supportive service program who, based on assessments by instructional and support service personnel, are in greatest need of the widest range of services. (This selection process is different from that used to select non-Title I children to participate in local budget supportive service programs. For those children referrals from classroom teachers are channeled through the principal of each school, who then refers these children to supportive service personnel.) Once the Title I selection process has been completed, the group of instructional and support service personnel continue to function as a team, holding regular meetings to discuss the progress of the children participating in the program. In addition, there are district-wide meetings of each type of specialist, such as the social workers, who assess the progress of their particular component in the program from a district-wide perspective.

B. Guidance and psychology

During the four-year period studied, this supportive service has been offered in all 12 of the eligible Title I schools, with the personnel assigned to each school for several days each week. During the 1973-74 school year there was also a half time psychologist assigned to the pre-kindergarten program, the child development center. However, as the number of personnel

has declined from 5 (3.8 FTE) in 1973-74 to 3 (1.5 FTE) in 1976-77, the amount of time spent at each school has also declined. "All Title I schools still got these services; we try to keep our personnel spread out fairly evenly."

As leader of the Title I team, the psychologist's principal duties include conducting case conferences with other Title I personnel on each participating child, as well as evaluating the psychological needs of Title I children, and providing some limited counseling services with children and their parents. Actual therapy, however, is not provided by the Title I psychologist. When therapy is needed, the Title I psychologist will refer the child and/or parents to the community mental health center. The personnel of the guidance and psychology program have advanced degrees in guidance and counseling or in psychology. There have been no special training programs for those offering Title I services, but twice monthly staff development meetings are held for the psychologists and counselors.

C. Social work

Until this year, 1976-77, social work services have been provided in all 12 of the Title I schools; this year, as a result of budget cuts, the service is only being provided in 2 of the Title I schools. This decrease was made necessary by the reduction in social work personnel from 6 FTE in 1973-74 to .5 FTE in 1976-77. The district has taken this action despite the fact that there are no social work services provided by local funds. (Social workers in a drug education program for high school students and a limited experimental pre-kindergarten program for 60 children are funded by other sources.)

Personnel in the social work program hold MSW's and many have had experience in social work agencies or the school system. Social work personnel provide liaison between the home and the school, coordinate their program with and make referrals to social service agencies in the community, and perform some counseling services with parents and children. One of the primary areas of counseling concerns cases of child abuse, of which there is a high incidence in the district. In addition to these three tasks, the social work program instituted a big brother-big sister program in the high school which trained high school students to become big brothers and sisters to the Title I children in lower grade levels.

D. Speech Therapy

The speech therapy program has suffered less than social work from budget cutbacks. Still, the cutbacks have been severe. In the course of the four year study period, the number of FTE's in the speech therapy program has declined from 5 to 2. However, as is the case with the guidance program, the reduced personnel are spread evenly over the current Title I schools. As part of the Title I team, the main function of the speech therapist is to work with language development and to identify and treat communication disorders. The therapists conduct regular screenings of Title I children to identify those who need speech therapy. Identified Title I children are then placed in a language development program or are provided individual therapy. In some cases children are referred to specialists outside the school for treatment. As with the guidance and psychology program, there are regular staff development meetings for speech therapy personnel twice a month.

E. Library/resource center

A component of the district's Title I program which no longer exists was provided by a Title I librarian who selected materials suitable for Title I children and assisted them in the school library in conjunction with the reading instruction specialist. In 1973-74 there were, in addition to the Title I librarian, 2 clerks who were responsible for filing Title I materials and making them readily accessible to Title I students. Though these clerks were dropped after the 1973-74 school year, the services of the full-time Title I librarian were continued until the end of 1975-76, when the library component of the Title I program was discontinued.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

Working from a team approach, supportive service personnel provide social services which are complementary to the educational services provided by instructional personnel. The purpose of this team approach is to integrate supportive services with the educational process, so that "supportive services personnel, functioning as a team, can avoid being peripheral to the educative process and respond directly and effectively to the needs of the student." The team approach also allows for the concentration of both instructional and supportive services on those children in need of the widest range of services.

Within the framework of this team approach the goals of the supportive service component include in-service training with school staff to focus on the needs of the whole child; avoiding duplication of services; involving the parents in the compensatory program; identifying problems,

specifying behavioral objectives, and providing treatment or referral for treatment for participating children. During its existence, the child development center's supportive services had the additional goal of early intervention in the educational and environmental needs of the pre-kindergarten child, many of whom came from foster homes or orphanages.

B. Decision-making process

Major decisions affecting the supportive service programs funded under Title I are based on a formal needs assessment and evaluation process that occurs each spring. An advisory committee composed of the instructional service coordinator, the supportive service coordinator, the Director of Federal and State Programs, the Director of Pupil Personnel Services, and the principals of the Title I schools is responsible for formulating plans for the Title I programs for the coming year. It bases its decision primarily upon the needs assessment made by the professional staff at the individual school level; this assessment is part of the process through which the professional staff decides what sort of treatment is needed by individual students. In addition, the advisory committee receives recommendations from the PAC of each school, the district PAC, and various community organizations such as public health centers, day care centers and community action groups--all of which are invited to attend meetings of the advisory committee. The committee then formulates plans for the Title I programs for the coming year; those plans are then reviewed by the Superintendent of the District, and, with his approval, are presented to the District Board of Education for final approval.

The respondents felt that in the past few years "There are no decisions to be made anymore except which staff members you are going to cut." The advisory committee has set explicit priorities for the district

for cutting back on programs based on the type of service provided. Of greatest priority is the Title I instructional program. However, even this service has felt some effect of the cutbacks. For example, the number of reading specialists this year is 10; in 1973-74 there were 17. Of second priority are those supportive services which provide services directly to the Title I children, such as the speech therapy program. Of third priority are those services, such as social work, which work with the parents and families of Title I children. This order of priorities has been followed in making program cuts over the years, and accounts for the severe cutbacks in the supportive service programs, particularly in social work.

The process of cutting back programs has been a painful one for the district. Parents were particularly concerned about the loss of the child development center. "They came en masse in opposition to the curtailment of the child development center. But we had to say to them, 'Either we cut this program out, or we cut out our reading and math programs.'" Parents have also objected to other cutbacks. The respondents feel now that when they reply to PAC requests for more funds, they must say, "'OK, which type of personnel would you rather lose; would you rather lose your right hand or your left hand?' And that's what it's coming down to. I can play a tape of a PAC meeting with parents begging for more services. Parents now say 'Don't tell me about any more cuts; tell me about where you're going to <u>add</u> services.'" Moreover, though the parents of Title I children have two means of expressing their feelings--through the individual PAC of each school and through the District PAC--each PAC seems to "fight for its own" and "shows little concern about the school on the other side of town." Thus some degree of factionalism is a characteristic of PAC input.

C. Needs assessment and program evaluation

Each supportive service and instructional staff member conducts a formal needs assessment and evaluation of his or her program each April, based on SRA test instruments where possible. Such quantitative results of the program's success are "the backbone of the planning for each year's program." However, this policy has caused problems for supportive services since in some areas the quantitative evaluation procedures are necessarily fuzzy. For instance, the lack of hard data to show success or failure of the social work program was one important factor in the decision to cut this program back as funds decreased. In contrast, the speech therapy program lends itself to quantitative evaluation and is thus particularly valued. Children who have participated in this program have shown dramatic improvement in language ability on achievement tests. In addition to this formal process, the district considers its needs assessment and evaluation to be "an on-going program which is underway all the time."

VI. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS AND FUTURE PLANS

The most striking aspect of supportive services in this district is the continuing cutback in programs made necessary by the decreases in Title I allocations. The respondents, both of whom had spent several years building up a comprehensive instructional and supportive service program, were quite upset--anguished is not too strong a term--over these cuts. One places the blame for reduction in funds for his district on the

> absolute political machinations of the senators and congressmen from predominately rural areas who are protecting their interests. I can prove right here in this state that the moneys are going into rural and suburban districts at the expense of the cities. I've had guys from little communities who have suddenly gotten Title I funds calling me to ask me what to do with them. It makes me sad. The kids who really need these services [inner city kids] are not getting them.

The other respondents is even more direct in his criticism:

> You know, you asked me how we set our priorities, how we make our needs assessment. Well, I would like to ask the same questions of the policy makers, and I don't think they can answer them properly. We had a program here of which we were justly proud. It was innovative and served as a model for other districts. It operated properly; our audit in 1975 showed that. So, a program that's really working has had its funds drastically reduced and has now been effectively ruined. We'll be out of the business [of providing Title I services] in the next two years."

The district has had no success finding other funds to replace its Title I losses. Like most school districts, there is a budget crunch on the local as well as the national level. However, the respondents have had some success in obtaining reallocated funds from the state, though these funds have not amounted to more than a small fraction of lost funds.

The respondents consider supportive services important aspects of the Title I program. The team approach served to end the isolation of the instructional and supportive service personnel from each other by effecting a daily working relationship among all Title I staff and made the supportive service programs an integral part of the Title I services in the district. The supportive service program has operated properly, from their point of view, in that it was not "simply a referral or psychometric type service." The psychologist, for example, was intricately involved in the entire program as team leader, evaluator, and provider of counselling services.

The effect of the changes in the supportive service programs has been more a problem of less students receiving services than a dilution of services, according to my respondents. However, one said, "I would have to say that there is a possibility that our services have been diluted. When you spread somebody thin the services aren't provided on a consistent basis. For instance, if the psychologist is assigned to a building for one

day a week, then that's the only day the kids get his services." However, the district has tried to maintain the level of services provided by drastically cutting down on the number of children served rather than serving the same number of children but decreasing the level of services.

In addition to the obvious problems stemming from the loss of Title I funds, the district has encountered other problems with Title I regulations instituted by the State. One of these regulations resulted in the loss of the child development center for pre-kindergarted children. The requirement of comparability has also caused problems. Most of these were solved by an arrangement worked out between the State and the district which specifies Title I caseloads for support service personnel. Other difficulties with comparability have not been so satisfactorily resolved. The State requires the district to meet comparability requirements in per-pupil expenditures. Since some schools have more senior staff than others and consequently higher staff salaries, there have been some discrepancies. As a result, "in order to make up for such inequities brought about by seniority, we've been forced to hire additional staff in certain schools in order to increase the dollar-for-student ratio in that school. It has not always proven to be the most effective use of funds."

Obviously, the district would like to revise Title I regulations so that they could receive more funds. The respondents were particularly anxious that the 1974 formulas for determining Title I funds be reversed, especially the use of the Orshansky index and the ruling that AFDC counts could only be used at two-thirds their value. They would also like to see the ruling rescinded which resulted in the loss of the child development center.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 3

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

- A. Pre-1973-74
- B. 1973-74 and 1974-75--The "Pre-Orshansky Years"
- C. 1975-76 and 1976-77--The "Post-Orshansky Years"

III. DESCRIPTION OF DISTRICT'S SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

- A. Social Workers
- B. Swimming Program
- C. Psychological Examiners

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Goals
- B. Decision-Making
- C. Needs Assessment and Program Evaluation

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

The school district serves an inner city with a population of slightly less than 70,000 that, in recent years, has experienced many of the same problems facing larger core cities. There has been an out-migration of the middle class and an in-migration of rural poor, many of whom have been attracted by the city's rich assortment of social services: clinics, hospitals, public housing, and a variety of public and private welfare agencies. To maintain these services despite a declining tax base, the city now has the highest taxing rate in the state. Unlike many other urban areas, the city has relatively few members of racial or ethnic minority groups. Of a current public school population of about 11,000, only 1 percent are Black and less than 1 percent are of American Indian, Asian, or Hispanic background.

The district is divided into nine elementary school areas, each of which is served by a single large school or several small ones. From funding sources other than Title I, the district offers its students a number of regular and special education instructional services, health and psychological services, and lunch and milk programs. Seven of the elementary areas have been determined eligible for Title I programs on the basis of census poverty figures, AFDC and public housing figures, surveys conducted by the district in some school areas, and, in recent years, free lunch counts. Title I instructional programs are operated in all eligible elementary schools which, for the 1976-77 school year, include eleven public and two non-public schools. Although several schools have been closed and replaced by new ones, the number of schools offering Title I instructional programs has remained relatively constant throughout the period studied.

The single most significant influence on the operation of the district's Title 1 program over the past four years was the reduction in the district's Title I allocation that occurred in 1975-76 with the introduction of the Orshansky formula. That year the district received about $400,000, a drop of over $120,000 from the preceding year and of over $200,000 from 1973-74. The cut forced the district to reexamine its entire Title I program: to reduce funding for its most essential instructional and supportive services, and to discontinue altogether most of its smaller programs. Currently the district offers only one Title I supportive service - social workers - in seven public and one non-public schools.

Throughout the history of its Title I program the district has maintained a core of basic instructional services (staffed by reading consultants, teacher aides and assistants) and its social work service. Prior to 1975-76, it had also been able to use Title I funds to initiate a number of programs on a limited or experimental basis which, when proven successful, were extended to schools throughout the district and funded from sources other than Title I. During the first years of its Title I program, for example, the district introduced a media center in one of its Title I schools. The program proved successful and the following year was expanded and operated on a regional basis through a grant of Title III funds. After operating for three years under Title III, the program was taken over and funded by the local budgets of the participating school districts.

II. Chronological Narrative: the Development of Supportive Services

A. Pre-1973-74

As noted previously, the district has in the past successfully initiated several programs with Title I funds and subsequently taken over those programs and maintained them with funding from state and local sources. Perhaps the most successful example -- one which falls outside the four year period studied -- is the district's creation of a resource center. As early as 1966 the district opened a resource center in one of its Title I schools. As Title I funding proved inadequate to operate the center at the level desired by the district, for the next three years the district, in cooperation with other districts in the region, obtained Title III funding to maintain the center. Since the expiration of that grant the participating school districts have operated the resource center with funding from local sources. It has grown considerably in size and now offers a variety of materials to the participating districts, including a library of some 3500 films.

The social worker supportive service was also begun in the district well before the beginning of the 1973-74 school year. In 1965 a social agencies committee of the local United Way made a survey of community needs and reported, as one of its recommendations, that the district employ a school social worker. At that time the district had no social workers. In response to the recommendation the district school board decided to implement a social work program as its first Title I supportive service. Since, at the beginning of the Title I program, the district had a considerable amount of newly available money ("a windfall"), it did not give extensive consideration to

alternative sources of funding for the program. Sufficient Title I funds were available for salaries, travel allowances, and a discretionary allowance for items such as clothing.

To organize the program, the district obtained the assistance of an experienced MSW who had been working for a local private agency. Salary scales for the social workers were based on those of the best private agencies in the city. The Title I program began operating in 1966 with three social workers and a director of social services. The social work program operated under the director for several years, but, just prior to the period studied, the director's position was eliminated. Throughout the program the social workers have been based in particular Title I schools, but now, without the director, they function under the direct supervision of the school principals. The district has found this to be a preferable arrangement since it allows the principals to focus the activities of the social workers according to the specific needs of the children in the different schools.

B. 1973-74 and 1974-75 -- the "Pre-Orshansky Years"

During these years, the district's supportive services programs were, as compared to subsequent years, well funded. The district employed as many as nine Title I social workers each of whom had (in 1974-75), in addition to an allowance for travel and a small allowance for supplies and materials, a discretionary fund of $500. The district operated a weekly swimming program for about 150 children in special education programs. In 1974-75 it was able to hire four

psychological examiners with Title I funds. That same year it also offered a small hearing conservation class with individualized instruction for children with limited hearing impairment.

C. 1975-76 and 1976-77 -- the "Post-Orshansky Years"

With the introduction of the Orshansky formula for calculating Title I allocations, the district's appropriation dropped substantially from over $600,000 in 1973-74 and $520,000 in 1974-75 to $400,000 in 1975-76. That drop forced the district to reevaluate its entire Title I program and to make a number of cuts, reducing the level of some programs and eliminating others altogether. The swimming program was dropped, summer programs were eliminated, funds for supplies and materials were eliminated from the Title I budget and the social workers' discretionary funds were eliminated. The psychological examiners and the hearing conservation class were taken over by local budget sources.

For 1975-76 the number of Title I social workers was cut from 9 to 4 and the service was provided through Title I funds in only 4 schools.

For the 1975-76 school year a temporary grant of CETA funds enabled the district to retain several of the social workers who were dropped from the Title I budget. For the 1976-77 school year, however, the district has been able to restore some of the social workers to the Title I budget so that for the current school year there are 8 Title I social workers serving 7 public and 1 non-public schools. The restoration of the social workers was made possible in part by the district's receipt of some impact area funds, though these have not nearly replaced the amounts cut from the basic Title I grant. The district has not been

able to restore to its Title I budget any money for supplies and materials or for the social workers' discretionary funds. Since, moreover, the district has not been able to restore the services that were dropped or to add new ones, the social worker program is the only supportive service currently offered in the district.

III. Description of District's Supportive Services

A. Social Workers

The social workers are assigned to the Title I schools having the highest concentrations of students participating in the Title I instructional programs. One school, with a particularly high concentration of disadvantaged students, has 2 social workers. In all schools, the social workers operate under the supervision of the school principal. Any child in the participating schools who is identified as needing the services of the social worker is eligible to receive them; in most cases these are the children participating in the Title I instructional programs. A child is identified as needing the services of the social worker by the pupil evaluation team. A child having problems in the classroom is referred to the team by his teacher; the team then attempts to determine the specific nature of each child's problems and to devise an individualized program of remedial services. Where appropriate the child is referred to the social workers. Although most in-school referrals come through the pupil evaluation team, other referrals may come from teachers, principals, parents, or agencies outside the school which have dealt with a child.

The social workers provide their services in a variety of contexts: working with children in individual or small group sessions

that meet on a regularly scheduled basis over long periods of time, or in small, relatively short-term 'special purpose' groups; working with parents in individual consultations at school or in the parents' homes and in group sessions such as the weekly "Koping with Kids" program conducted at the school; and working on behalf of children in dealings with public and private social service agencies outside the school. In these various contexts the social workers provide many kinds of services and utilize a number of different techniques. Working with children, they provide direct counseling and offer programs such as "T. A. For Kids," D.U.S.O., and "Inside Out". They have arranged for children to participate in "Big Brother" and "Big Sister" programs;and they have obtained funding from local private agencies for a camping program in which culturally deprived students spend a week in an outdoor classroom setting. They have assisted in providing clothing for needy students, in past years using the discretionary funds allocated from the Title I budget, and more recently using clothing donated to the school or referring students to agencies outside the school. Though most of the recipients have been entitled to some clothing allowance through public assistance, children would frequently fail to obtain that assistance--either because of their parents' inability to deal with welfare agencies or to manage family finances, or because of the agencies' delays in processing and forwarding assistance checks -- and would come to school without adequate clothing.

The social workers' dealings with parents include such activities as obtaining medical histories and permission for testing, explaining to the parent a child's problems at school and the steps being

taken by the school to deal with those problems, intervening in family problems affecting the child, or helping parents to deal with their own attitudes which become reflected in the behavior of the child, e.g., 'school phobia'. They help children and their parents in dealings with agencies outside the school, obtaining referrals for children whose problems require specialized treatment, and serving as active advocates for their clients in obtaining services to which they are entitled. One respondent noted that many local social service agencies are 'building based' and that the city has few AFDC caseworkers who make home visits. The Title I social workers, in contrast, make frequent home visits and often provide direct assistance to families in their contacts with service agencies. They act as a primary liaison between the school, the child, his home, and the community, and may spend as much as 30-40% of their time in contacts with parents. Though the district has no regular social worker program budgeted from local sources for its elementary schools, there is one social worker paid from district funds who serves in the junior high schools. Local budget sources do provide for one elementary guidance counsellor and a number of secondary school guidance personnel (19 counsellors for 1976-77).

B. Swimming Program

For several years prior to the 1975-76 school year the district provided a weekly swimming program for about 150 EMR and learning disabled public school children. Title I funds were used to provide transportation to the YMCA and Boys' Club pools and to pay for the services of swimming instructors. This program was discontinued at the beginning of the 1975-76 school year when the district's Title I allocation was cut

back. Although the district now has two swimming pools of its own in newly opened schools, funds have not been available to reinstitute the special swimming program.

C. Psychological Examiners

During the 1974-75 school year the district allocated Title I funds to hire four psychological examiners (2 psychometricians and 2 diagnostic and prescriptive teachers). The examiners were to test for and diagnose the specific learning disorders and emotional problems of Title I children who might need special education. The district was aware of pending state legislation that would mandate testing and evaluation for all students in the district who needed special services. With Title I money, the district was able to begin an extensive testing program to determine the learning and emotional problems of the Title I students a year early. When the state legislation took effect the following year, funding for the psychological examiners was taken over by local budget sources.

IV. PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals of Supportive Services

The overall goals of the district's Title I program--in both its instructional and supportive services--is to provide direct services to meet the needs of educationally and economically disadvantaged children. In working toward these goals, the social workers have two main functions: in consultation with other specialists on the pupil evaluation teams, they attempt to identify the problems impeding a child's progress in school and to plan a program of individualized instruction and services that will help the child to surmount these problems; and, working directly with the students and their parents, school staff and local social service agencies, they provide a variety of specific services designed to meet the medical, psychological, and social needs of children in Title I schools. To define the more specific aims of their service the social workers have developed a list of the typical problems or needs of Title I children, the behavioral changes required to resolve the problems or to meet the needs, and the activities of the social workers designed to effect those changes. For the problem of absenteeism due to school phobia, for example, the desired change is "better attendance through family growth" and the services provided to effect the change might include counseling by the social workers, working with parents through a weekly family life education group, or referral for specialized treatment.

B. Decision-making

Each spring the district begins its Title I planning based on an approximate allocation figure supplied by the state. The Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, who also chairs the meetings of the district-wide Parents Advisory Committee, has general responsibility for coordinating

Title I budgeting activities. He works closely with the special projects coordinator in working out the details of the proposal, consulting with the parent advisory committees and the state Title I coordinator and keeping the district school board informed on the development of the proposal. Formally, the proposal requires the approval of the school administration and the district school board before it is forwarded to the state. In practice, the parent advisory committees have a large and active voice in shaping the district's Title I proposal.

One respondent described the initial planning process as follows:

> We go to our Title I Board. And we happen to have a very strong advisory committee; there's been a lot of continuity on it. We say, we're going to get, we assume, approximately (for example) the same as last year. Then they decide whether we're going to maintain the same services, whether we're going to enlarge any services, or whether we're going to add any new services or delete services, based on how much money we have and what they feel is the most effective program.

In recent years the advisory committees at the individual school level have played active roles in determining programs and services to be offered in their schools. Working with the staff and administration at their school, the members of these PACs prepare and submit to the district-wide committee a recommendation on the nature of and the staff level for programs in their school. When the district learned that its Title I funds for the 1975-76 school year would be severely cut, it organized a series of planning meetings to consider the alternative ways in which it could reduce its programs. The district requested that the advisory committee and the principal for each Title I school meet to set priorities for its school and recommend to the district-wide committee the specific services that should be retained, reduced, or eliminated for that school. Though the district provided some guidance and general recommendations, the decisions on what services were to be provided at each school were, for the most part, made by the individual schools.

As the district's proposal gradually takes shape during the normal planning process, it is submitted to the PAC several times for their review and recommendations, to ensure that the final product "represents their thinking." Whenever possible, the district implements the recommendations of the PACs; at times when the PAC has recommended programs that could not be funded under Title I the district has attempted to secure funding from other sources. Throughout the year the PAC is kept informed of the progress of ongoing Title I programs; its regular monthly meetings usually include lunch (provided through local budget funds) and an informational presentation on some aspect of the district's program.

Speaking generally about the role of the advisory committee in the planning process, one respondent commented: "I think we've done a good job; the involvement is there; the people are happy with their involvement in telling us how they think the money ought to be spent. We've got the research to back us up on what we're doing. It's good; it's working." The one reservation he mentioned regarding the committee concerned its size--that attendance at PAC meetings had grown along with the PAC's role and importance in planning. With as many as fifty persons attending meetings at which everyone is given an opportunity to speak, progress is sometimes slow and discussions may wander toward very broad questions of the district's overall Title I allocation.

In planning its Title I program, the district initially selects the eligible schools on the basis of a variety of economic criteria. In the past the district has conducted some local surveys of its own, but has experienced great difficulty in getting parents to complete and return its questionnaires. Consequently, in recent years, the district has been using free lunch counts with greater frequency. The district provides at least some instructional services in all eligible schools, but to some extent concentrates its resources

in those schools with the greatest need as determined by the proportions of economically and educationally disadvantaged students in the participating schools and as judged by district personnel on the basis of their experience in dealing with the problems of students throughout the district. Similarly, the schools with the Title I social workers are "the schools with the highest density of kids with all kinds of family problems. . .school related family problems." The district has, from time to time, reconsidered its policy of serving all eligible schools with basic instructional programs. On these occasions a representative of the district has reviewed the Title I guidelines with the PAC and explained:

> . . . here's what the guidelines are. We really don't have to give it to all the schools if we don't want to. We might concentrate on three or four schools and really do a bang up jobs in those schools. . . . But our philosophy over the years has been that we try to help all Title I schools.

The district has for years enjoyed a good working relationship with state Title I officials. The state provides assistance in planning and some general guidelines to the effect that the district should spend Title I money in the areas of reading and math, but issues no specific rules on what instructional or supportive service programs the district should offer. One respondent commented that "the state will tell you what you can't spend money on, but not what you can spend it on." Specifically, he added that "a number of years ago" the district had been told by the state that it could not spend Title I money on programs for physical education, music, or art. Since that time the district has funded such programs from non-Title I sources and has not had any other proposed services turned down at the state level. In general the state has been quite supportive of the district and has assisted in the district's efforts to find additional funding for its programs.

The respondents reported having no particular difficulty in deciding how to balance allocations between instructional and supportive services within

the district. There is no state or district formula on the proportions of funds that can be expended for the different categories of services. The district approaches the problem of allocation not in terms of "instructional versus supportive" services, but rather in terms of need. As one respondent explained, the district's overall priority is "what is going to help the child. . .(what is going to be of) direct service to the child." Or again:

> What are the greatest needs? And as we've had to cut back. . .we have sustained those programs which, in the opinion of the administration, and in the opinion of the parents advisory committee, are the most essential. And this is why we are now down to practically three or four very basic programs. . . .But it's never been a question of how much should go for education and how much for supportive.

C. Needs Assessment and Program Evaluation

As noted previously, the initial determination of need, and the primary impetus, for the creation of a social worker program came from the survey conducted by the social agencies arm of the local equivalent of the United Way. At that time social work services were not offered at any schools in the state, and a district representative who interviewed principals throughout the district during the planning of the first Title I programs recalls that the principals did not identify social workers as among the district's most pressing needs. Many school district personnel, however, were aware of the recommendation (some by virtue of their direct involvement in the agencies that conducted the survey), and the respondent could not recall that anyone had denied the need for social workers or opposed the district's decision to begin a program.

Assessments of the need to continue the program have been based both on statistical indicators of need (concentrations of economically and/or educationally disadvantaged children, records maintained by social workers on services rendered) and on the considerable experience and judgment of persons

throughout the district who have worked with the program itself or with children who could benefit from the services provided through the program. The district has been fortunate in being able to retain many of its Title I personnel from year to year; the two main respondents for the interview, for example, had both served in the district since the beginning of Title I programs. Through tenure such as theirs the district's personnel have accumulated a wealth of first-hand knowledge of the problems requiring the continuing efforts of the social workers.

Evaluation of the district's programs takes place each year at the individual school level. In compliance with reporting requirements, personnel who provide services compile figures as requested on forms supplied by the state. Though the requested information has varied from year to year, examples of the kinds of information the social workers have provided include numbers of children to whom services were provided in long-term individual or small group casework, in short-term special purpose groups, in testing or diagnosis through the pupil evaluation team; and judgments on the number of children who have improved or failed to show improvement as a result of the social work services. These figures are submitted from the schools to the district offices where they are assembled for submission to the state.

In the past the social workers were required to maintain extensive records and to report regularly on all contacts with children and parents, providing quantitative data as well as their judgments and evaluations of each child's progress. Now, at least partly as a result of family privacy legislation, the social workers keep few records themselves, instead contributing to records maintained by the pupil evaluation team which are now the primary records kept on a child's problems, treatment, and progress.

For the district, the critical evaluation of its Title I programs is the one that takes place in the context of planning for the following year's

programs. More important for the district than the required formal evaluation is the evaluation of each school's programs made by the school's staff and parent advisory committee. The district's planning decisions, particularly those made when Title I funds were cut back, provide a good indication of how the district values its various programs. When faced with funding reductions for 1975-76, the district chose to retain, though with some staff reductions, its core instructional programs, its teacher aides and assistants (who work with the reading program), and its social work program. It eliminated smaller programs (swimming) and "extras" (the discretionary allowance for clothing, field trips, an adjunct to the reading program in which students were each given several paperback books to keep as their own), and funds for supplies and materials. Neither of the major respondents could recall any group that had urged that the social work program be discontinued in order to preserve instructional programs. Though some personnel cuts were necessary in the social work program, the district went to considerable effort to obtain CETA funds to retain these social workers and has now (with some help from impact area funds) restored most of them to the regular Title I budget.

In general, the district feels that it has been able to continue its Title I programs without great loss of effectiveness despite the strains of reduced funding. By retaining funds wherever possible for staff salaries, through its good fortune in achieving staff continuity, and with the active support given to Title I programs by the central district office and Title I school principals, the district has preserved its most essential instructional and supportive services at effectively functioning levels.

SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

The Title I program in this district operates in an environment that is particularly rich in instructional and supportive services provided by the school district through local, state, and other non-Title I funds, and in social services provided by municipal and state agencies outside the school. Each elementary school area is staffed with physical education, music, and art teachers; each has a library/resource center; each has a number of special education staff prsonnel to provide such services as student testing, psychological evaluation, speech therapy, and treatment for learning disorders. With support staff included, the district's pupil:teacher ratio is on the order of 17:1; with additional teacher aides and assistants included, it is 13:1. The district offers free or reduced lunches and a free milk program. It contracts with the local public health agency to provide nursing services and physical examinations for its students. This network of existing services, even if more Title I funds were available, would limit the district's attempts to establish new supportive service programs. As one respondent noted, "You cannot push onto Title I, programs that you already have funded under your own school budget."

At present the district sees no possibility of taking over its social work program with local budget funds, as it was formerly able to take over other programs begun under Title I. Local budget sources are being strained by the city's dwindling tax base and already high tax rates, and it was only through the temporary CETA grant that the district was able to keep from losing over half of its social workers for the 1975-76 school year. Were the city to attempt to provide any social workers at its elementary schools through local budget funds, moreover, it would have to provide such services at all its schools in order to meet comparability requirements and to ensure that its

Title I service was in addition to that available to all children through local budget sources.

With the reduction in the level of its Title I funding in the last two years the district's main problem has been to decide how to retain as much of the existing essential services as possible (reading consultants, teacher aides and assistants, and social workers), rather than to consider adding new supportive services. Given its present Title I funding, the district does not plan any significant change in the priorities it has set for its Title I programs over the years. District personnel were able, however, to indicate several areas in which there is a need for additional services for the Title I children. These include the restoration of services that were dropped, e.g., the summer programs, the swimming program, funds for supplies and materials, funds for the discretionary clothing allowance. They include additional psychological and psychiatric services as well as other health related services that have never been offered in the district under Title I. Respondents mentioned health education and dental care as specific needs, but the district has not attempted to obtain Title I funds for programs in these areas. At one time the district did consider hiring a Title I nurse to serve in one school, but arrangements were made to fund the position from other sources.

The respondents, in brief, had no difficulty in specifying needs of Title I children that might be met by new Title I services or by expansion of the existing services--were additional funds available. Speaking generally about the role of schools in meeting the many needs of disadvantaged students, one respondent added:

> There are so many services that these kids need. I don't know really any more what the rightful role of the school is. We give them breakfast, we give them milk, we give them lunch. We have after school programs and these kinds of things. . .But I don't know what the answer is, because so many of these kids need so much more.

Even where the community services are available to meet specific needs, children often do not get them because their parents do not avail themselves of the services, and there are limits to what, for example, the schools' Title I social workers can properly do:

> . . .I don't know what you do with this situation. I really don't know how much following up you can do. And how much can you force at home? And this is true over and over again.

When asked about problems with state or federal guidelines that they might have encountered in planning or administering Title I programs, the respondents mentioned only the nuisance of having to deal with so many regulations. One respondent did, however, provide some suggestions on how Title I funding criteria might be revised to ease the hardship worked on the district by the Orshansky formula. The suggestions included basing allocations on a minimum percentage of disadvantaged children which a district would have to have in order to qualify for Title I, making allocations to LEAs rather than to counties because "a core city's allocation could be severely weakened when prosperous suburbs within the county are counted," a change that would prevent the sudden decrease in funds from one year to the next that hit the district for the 1975-76 school year, and a change that would make additional money available to meet the needs of children who are educationally, but not economically, disadvantaged.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 4

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

- A. 1973-74
- B. 1974-75
- C. 1975-76
- D. 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF DISTRICT'S SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

- A. Social Work
- B. Community Services
- C. Health Service
- D. Transportation

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Goals
- B. Needs Assessment and Evaluation
- C. Program Decision-Making

V. SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

The district serves an urban area with a population of slightly over 50,000. The current enrollment in the district's 17 public (10 elementary) and four private schools is approximately 12,000 students, a figure that has fallen by about 150 since 1973-74. This slight overall decline is the result of a drop of about 450 in public school enrollment and an increase of 300 in non-public enrollment. About 60 percent of the total district enrollment is black, 38 percent is white, and the remaining two percent is American Indian and Spanish surnamed.

Schools are selected for the Title I program on the basis of the free school lunch count. All schools with a count higher than the district average participate in the Title I programs. During the past four years, the number of public schools taking part in the Title I program has grown from six schools in 1973-74 to the current total of eleven. Private schools have taken part in Title I only once, during the 1974-75 school year, when two non-public schools participated.

With the increase in the number of participating schools, both the number of students participating in Title I (1745) and the budget for the program($735,000) have doubled since 1973-74.

Title I instructional programs in the district focus on reading and math for children in kindergarten through eighth grade. Title I supportive services--social work and community services--are offered in all of the schools with Title I instructional services. In the 1973-74 school year the district's Title I supportive services also included health, transportation, and a

clothing service offered as part of its community services program. The clothing service, however, was discontinued after 1973-74 and is no longer offered. The health program was cut back severely in 1974-75 and was dropped altogether in 1975-76. The transportation program remained in operation through 1975-76. With these cuts and the progressive increase in the district's total Title I allocation, the supportive services share of the Title I budget has declined from a high of 9 percent in 1974-75 to a current 3 percent. Expenditures for the two services--social work and community services--that the district has maintained throughout the four year period have not been cut, however, and have in fact increased by $5,000 during the period.

In addition to the supportive services provided by Title I, services in social work, guidance counseling, speech therapy, psychological testing, and health are provided to all students in the district either from local budget funds or from county or state funded community programs. The school district provides a guidance counselor for each junior and senior high school and a social worker for every three or four schools, elementary included. These social workers are called home-school coordinators or attendance coordinators; their primary responsibility is to serve as a link between the school and the students' homes. They work with those students who have poor attendance records, investigating the problems and aiding the students and their parents in solving them. Local budget funds also support a district speech therapist, who treats children referred by principals or teachers. Psychological testing is provided by professionals under contract to the district. The district does not support a school nurse program, but Public Health nurses come into the schools to conduct routine testing and screening. If a child becomes ill at school there is a sick room where he can rest until his parents can come to take him home.

State Title I officials have indicated concern about Title I supportive service programs that duplicate services offered by other sources in the community. They argue that since many supportive services are available to students from state, county, or municipal service agencies, it is the responsibility of the local school district to identify and refer children to these services rather than to provide duplicate services from Title I funds. This state policy was behind the district's decision to drop its health and clothing programs and remains a source of increasing difficulty for districts throughout the state that are trying to maintain supportive service programs.

In addition to encouraging cutbacks in existing Title I supportive service programs when alternative sources exist, the state has also discouraged districts from allocating funds to establish new services. For example, the district has twice requested a half-time parent coordinator for its community services (parent involvement) program so that the home school coordinators, who currently provide these services, might give more time to working directly with children. The state has denied this request both times, even though a nearby district has a parent coordinator on its Title I staff. The state maintains, in responding to the district's request, that while some funds may be spent in support of parent activities, these activities do not constitute a supportive service that warrants separate staffing.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74

During the 1973-74 school year the Title I program offered supportive services in health, social work, transportation, community services, and parent involvement. Of the 840 students participating in Title I instructional programs this year, approximately 750 received some form of supportive service, the majority from the social workers. The two social workers,

called home-school coordinators, served as liaisons between the school and the home of the Title I students. The coordinators visited the homes of Title I students with health, clothing, or other needs or who were having attendance or other school related problems. During these visits, the coordinators would discuss a child's problem with the parents and help the parents find the appropriate community agency to provide additional needed help. Activities connected with the home visits occupied a major portion of the coordinator's time.

The health and clothing services offered this year were also handled by the social worker/home-school coordinators. If, in dealing with a child and his parents, the social workers learned of a child's need for medical or dental care or for clothing, they would first attempt to secure the needed assistance through the resources of the community. If the services could not be obtained in this way, the social worker would, after verifying the family's inability to pay for the assistance, draw upon the health or community services budget of the Title I program to purchase medical or dental services or items of clothing. During the year forty children received assistance from the health service, primarily in the form of eyeglasses or hearing aids; fifty children received items of clothing purchased through Title I.

This year there was also a small parent involvement program for which Title I funds were spent. As its main effort, the district encouraged Title I teachers to invite parents to the schools to learn more about the Title I program, but the program met with little success. Title I funds

were used for parents' transportation to these school visits and to the regular parent advisory council meetings, to purchase refreshments for the PAC meetings, and to distribute booklets which explained how parents could work more effectively to help their children in school.

Transportation services for kindergarten children were also provided by Title I this year. Until 1976-77 the kindergarten program in the district was supported entirely by Title I, and thus Title I funds were used to bus kindergarten students to and from classes.

B. 1974-75

This was the first year in which the state's policy of de-emphasizing Title I services and stressing utilization of community resources had a major impact on the district's program. The transportation program, in fact, was the only supportive service to remain unchanged from the previous year. The other services--health, clothing, social work and parent involvement--all experienced reductions in funding or significant changes in priorities and activities. The clothing program was dropped; funds for the health and dental services were cut by 70 percent despite the fact that the district's needs assessment survey had found that 60 percent of the Title I children needed dental care and that 90 percent of their parents were reluctant to do anything about that need unless a crisis arose. With the cuts in the Title I funding, the social workers invested more time this year in developing contacts with other community organizations that might meet the medical and dental needs of the Title I children. According to the respondent this extra effort enabled the social workers to secure the needed services for the majority of cases.

This year responsibility for parent involvement activities was assigned to the social workers, who began new efforts to increase parent involvement in Title I. These new programs (which eventually took up 25 percent of the social workers' time) included parent workshops on topics like child development, arranging for members of the PAC to contact other Title I parents to encourage their participation, and helping to arrange for parent volunteers to assist in Title I instructional activities. Special luncheon and dinner meetings were arranged for the Title I teachers and parents, so that the teachers could discuss and explain the program and respond to parents' questions. Title I funds were also used to provide babysitting services when needed by parents engaged in Title I activities. In planning for this program of increased parent involvement, the district Title I director included in the district's proposal a request for a part-time parent coordinator, but this request was turned down by the state.

C. 1975-76

This year the health services were completely eliminated from the district's program. As the respondent explained: "For years we had included these items in our budget so that we could have the money if we needed it. But now we realized that there were local agencies which could furnish these items, so we no longer included them in our budget."

The social work, parent involvement, and transportation programs operated as they had the year before. Once again the district requested a part-time parent coordinator, since it felt that the time the social workers were spending on parent activities was reducing their effectiveness in providing services to the Title I children. The request was however turned down a second time.

C. 1976-77

For the current school year there was only one significant change in the district's supportive services program; the transportation program for the kindergarten classes was taken over by the state. The social work and parent involvment activities continued as they had been the year before. This year the social workers are making a greater effort to do follow up studies on selected Title I children with social problems, in hopes that the district can use the information gathered through these studies to justify a request for additional social workers in future years.

III. DESCRIPTION OF TITLE I SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

A. Social Work

The Title I social work program was originally set up at the recommendation of the district principals and teachers to provide liaison between the school and the students' homes. It has been staffed throughout the four years of the study by two certified social workers designated as "home-school coordinators." (Prior to 1973 there were four coordinators, but because the district increased its local budget social work staff in 1973, the Title I staff was reduced to two.) The social workers/home-school coordinators have been the backbone of the district's supportive services program. When the district offered health and clothing programs, it was the social workers who managed the services; though these services are no longer paid for by Title I, the social workers remain responsible for helping the families of Title I children contact the community agencies that do provide them. In recent years, moreover, the social workers have also assumed responsibility for the parent involvement activities.

As the program is currently set up, the primary responsibilities of the social worker/home-school coordinators are:

1. making home visits to evaluate the home conditions and to discuss a child's special needs with his parents. Where a special need exists, the social worker makes certain that the parents understand the problem and know how and where to go to solve it. The home-school coordinator is also responsible for seeing that the needed services are obtained.

2. meeting with members of the local school staff so that they may better understand the needs and problems of Title I children. By so doing, the coordinators help to coordinate the efforts of the Title I and local school staffs and to bring about a better understanding between the two.

3. working with children who are potential dropouts or who have poor attendence records. The district has learned that children often find it easier to talk with the home-school coordinators than with their parents or teachers. Efforts are directed toward helping the child improve his self-image and his attitude toward school. Since these problems often require a home visit, the coordinators also attempt to improve the parents' attitudes toward school and education.

4. providing children with transportation to local agencies when needed.

5. initiating Juvenile Court action, in cases of child abuse or negelect, before turning the cases over to the appropriate state agency.

6. coordinating the parent involvement activities, which include parent conferences, parent workshops and the local PAC meetings.

All children taking part in the Title I instructional program are eligible for the services provided by the home-school coordinators. However, in order to avoid supplanting the work of the local budget social workers, a portion of the Title I children requiring aid are served by local budget staff.

As a part of its effort to justify the Title I social work program to state officials, the district conducts a social work needs assessment survey each summer before the new school year. Teachers, especially those in the Title I program, are asked to identify any current or potential problems which they feel may impede the educational progress of individual

Title I students. This school year's survey found that 55 percent of the Title I children were in need of clothing or came from families needing social welfare services, another 23 percent had physical problems requiring attention, and 35 percent had behavioral or attendance problems. The social work program gives priority to meeting clothing, health, and welfare needs of the Title I child and his family, because of the district's view that behavioral and attendence problems are often the by-products of these more basic problems.

B. Community Services

Before the 1974-75 school year the community services budget provided funds to purchase clothing for indigent Title I children. Since then the community services budget has provided funds for parent involvement activities. For both programs, the delivery of the service has been handled by the social workers. The district sees parent involvement as a very important part of its Title I activities: "We need parents who are committed to the education of their children."

The objectives of the parent involvement activities include:

1. increasing public and private awareness of the efforts made by the schools and by Title I to provide educational opportunities for the children.
2. motivating parents to utilize the educational opportunities provided for their children
3. assisting parents in becoming more effective in their attempts to motivate and educate their children

All Title I money for the parent involvement activities is channeled through the Parent Advisory Councils. The funds are used to support the activities of the six-member local councils at each of the district's Title I schools and the district-wide council, composed of two representatives from each of the local councils.

Parent involvement activities have become increasingly important for the district during the past few years. "A few years ago," the respondent indicated, "we only gave lip service to parent involvement." The district wanted parent participation, but "foundered around" in its early attempts to generate it. PAC meetings were not well attended; the 1973-74 program in which Title I teachers invited the parents of their students to the school for visits met with little success.

Since 1974-75, when the social workers/home-school coordinators took over the parent involvement activities, however, the district has taken a number of steps to improve parent participation. There are special parent-teacher dinners and parent workshops. The workshops are usually presented at meetings of the district-wide PAC to which all Title I parents are invited; at the request of a member of one of the school-level PACs, the workshop may be repeated for individual schools. As another means of encouraging parent participation, the Title I schools set aside special Title I visitation days for the students' parents. The social workers, in cooperation with the district-wide PAC, also sponsor a training session each year to acquaint new PAC members with the program. As an ongoing effort to keep parents informed during the year, the district publishes a Title I newsletter for the parents. And, to facilitate parent attendance at PAC meetings, the district provides money to pay for babysitting expenses.

C. Health Service

A limited Title I health program was in operation in the district until 1975-76. As with the clothing program, the social workers were the "staff" for this service.

All funds allocated for health were used to purchase medical and dental services for indigent Title I children. If a child with dental

or medical needs were referred to the home-school coordinator, the coordinator would help the child's family obtain these services from some community agency. If there were no other means of providing health services, funds from the Title I health program budget would be used to purchase them. In 1974-75 the budget for the health program was cut by 70 percent, and in 1975-76 it was dropped altogether.

D. Transportation

Transportation services were provided from Title I funds for children enrolled in the Title I funded kindergarten program until 1976-77, when the state assumed funding responsibility for the kindergartens in all districts. This year the state provides transportation services for the kindergarten.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The Title I director feels very strongly that children should only be asked to accomplish what they are capable of achieving. Title I children often have unmet physical needs or home problems which prevent them from achieving up to their capabilities. The goal of the Title I program is to remove as many of these barriers as possible so that the Title I child will have as much opportunity to succeed as any other child.

B. Evaluation and Needs Assessment

Each year the state sends the district a set of forms for evaluating its Title I program, one form to be filled out for each of the instructional and supportive service components of the district's program. This formal evaluation is coordinated by the district's Title I director and Title I evaluator. The evaluation includes statistics on the number, kinds, and eventual outcomes of contacts made by the social workers during the year.

Formerly the district has used this information on services rendered by its social workers in past years as part of the needs assessment used in its application to justify continuing the service for the coming year. The state argued that a proper needs assessment should include data on the perceived need for the service in the future as well as information on past services. Consequently for its needs assessment the district now includes the results of a survey it takes of its Title I teachers on the extent of the continuing need for the social work services.

C. Program Decision-Making

Planning for the Title I program begins with a meeting called by the Title I director for all Title I teachers and Title I school principals. At the meeting the participants discuss the district's current problems, consider suggestions for dealing with those problems, and set the district's priorities for the coming year. On the basis of this meeting and the district's survey of social work needs, the Title I director writes up the district's proposal. This proposal is then presented to the parents at a district-wide PAC meeting. "It's a routine thing, and the parents don't seem to question it." The respondent indicated, in fact, that the district would prefer getting more feedback from the parents on its program proposals.

As the district's decision-making process has become routinized there have been few changes in its supportive services programs in recent years. According to the respondent, the experimental stage for the district's Title I program is over and although the district does review its supportive services from year to year, it does not do so with a view to making major changes. The district feels that it knows what it needs and that its task now is to keep persuading the state to approve its requests for the programs required to meet those needs.

VI. SUMMARY

In earlier years, when this district first began its Title I instructional program, emphasis was placed on developing remedial services in the upper grades. Over the years, however, the emphasis has shifted to developing preventive measures in the earlier grades. Thus, where the program used to extend to the 12th grade, it now stops at the eighth grade, with preventive measures concentrated most on kindergarten through the third grade.

The Title I supportive service program is an important facet of this preventive approach. The central goals of the supportive service program are the identification and remedying of physical or social problems which are preventing Title I children from realizing their educational potential.

The Title I director would like to offer more supportive services. He indicated that he is "a strong believer in the social and medical services," and that he would like to see children receive a more comprehensive physical screening program in the earlier grades. He related one example of a young girl who had done very well on the IQ tests in the first grade and very poorly on them in the second grade although her performance throughout the year had been good. It turned out that she had a severe hearing defect but had compensated for it herself by always sitting near the front of the class. However, during the second grade IQ test, much of which was given orally, she had been placed near the back of the room. Due to the intervention of the Title I social worker the problem was detected and remedied by a hearing aid.

Despite his desire for more supportive services, the constraints placed on the Title I program by state officals require the director to

spend considerable energy fighting simply to maintain the supportive service program at its present level. Because of the state's policy he feels efforts to expand the program would be fruitless. "I don't see how there would be any way I could expand social services." Even now, in his estimation, the Title I children are not being adequately served. The problem lies in the fact that the Title I home-school coordinators devote 25 percent of their time to coordinating the parent involvement activities. But because of the improvement achieved by the home-school coordinators in parent participation, an area which he believes to be critical to the success of the Title I program, the director is reluctant to pull the coordinators out of those activities. The solution to the problem may come from outside of Title I. The director reported that the local school system may increase its social worker staff in the next year, which would benefit all of the children, including those in Title I.

Although the director is cognizant of the growing amount of his time spent justifying the district's supportive services, he does not intend to abandon his efforts. He realizes that by dropping supportive services he could extend the instructional services of Title I into the 9th grade and, although he feels that instructional services need the primary emphasis in Title I, he does not believe that a Title I program devoid of supportive services would be very effective.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 5

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

- A. Pre-1973
- B. 1973-1977

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

- A. Health

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Goals
- B. Decision-making Process
- C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

The district serves a highly mobile inner-city population of 82,000. During the four years studied, the district has experienced a steady drop in total enrollment with middle and upper income families moving to surrounding counties and many low income blacks returning to the South because of the lack of jobs in the area. In 1976-77 the total enrollment in the district was 15,700, down 2,000 from 1973-74. Blacks, the only sizeable minority group, make up 24 percent of the student enrollment. The district is served by 28 public and six non-public schools.

Schools are determined eligible for Title I programs on the basis of the AFDC count. (For several years prior to 1975-76, the district combined this count with the Free Lunch count, "but the State asked us to use one criterion only.") Every elementary school with a low-income population above the district average, which was 19 percent in 1976-77, is eligible for Title I programs. All of the eligible elementary schools participate in Title I programs; the junior and senior high schools no longer participate. During the four years studied, the number of schools participating in Title I has remained constant: 12 public schools and one non-public school. Children who rank in the 33rd percentile or below on the achievement test are eligible to participate in Title I programs. This eligibility criterion, which is determined by the state, has become increasingly restrictive over the years and, as a consequence, services have been increasingly concentrated on the students who are in greatest need.

Prior to the period studied, the district provided a wide variety of supportive services under Title I, "although they never accounted for a large part of the budget." However, as a result of "encouragement" from the state to place greater emphasis on academics and make Title I an "instructional"

program, the supportive services were either phased out or taken over by a state-funded program which provides supportive services to Title I qualifying elementary schools. During the four years studied, the only supportive service offered by Title I has been the payment of medical and dental fees. Psychological, social work and other health services are provided by local budget or state funds. Although the budget from this limited health program has increased, accounting for 0.4 percent of the Title I budget in 1976-77, the number of students served by the health program has steadily decreased. In 1976-77, only 14 students will have received Title I health services, as compared with 59 students in 1973-74.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. Pre-1973

In the years between 1965 and 1971 or 1972, the district Title I program offered the following supportive services: a library service, a "music specialist," "motor sensory" therapy, a summer program which included physical education and arts and crafts activities, home-school coordinators, free breakfast and health services. The home-school coordinators were the "key part" of the Title I supportive service program and were valued highly by the principals. Then in 1971 or 1972, "there was strong encouragement from the state to make Title I more instruction-oriented; the state program would pick up some supportive services." Prior to that time, Title I and state programs were providing both types of services. As a result of the state guidance, the Title I program took over the elementary teachers who had been part of the state program, while the state program took over junior high instructional programs and some of the supportive services program that had been under Title I, including some of the health aides, the home-school coordinator, and

the free breakfast program. The other Title I supportive programs were phased out and were not picked up by other funding sources. With these changes the Title I program became focused almost exclusively on instructional activities.

Another factor in the shift from supportive service to instructional programs was the difficulty of ensuring that Title I supportive services be provided only to Title I students. "When you get people in categories like librarian or nurse, it's hard to say that they're not serving some non-Title I people in a qualified school. There again the state has encouraged us to get out of those kinds of activities where it's hard to say that the service is going to just Title I kids."

B. 1973-77

The only supportive service provided by Title I between 1973 and 1977 has been the payment of medical and dental bills for indigent Title I children. Although the budget for this service has increased over the years along with the total Title I budget, the number of children served has decreased sharply, from 59 in 1973-74 to 14 students in 1976-77. The respondent accounted for this drop by suggesting that the number of referrals must have decreased: "perhaps kids are healthier now." He also explained that, since the State is being more strict about checking alternative sources before allowing Title I to pay for services, more of these cases are being paid for by other sources. The respondent also made clear that "our emphasis in Title I has been on instructional services; we've played down medical services. We've used it to deal with problems which seem to be interfering with performance in classes, but we haven't gone out looking for medical problems. Teachers are not especially encouraged to watch out for medical problems; if it's very apparent, it gets taken care of." The respondent could not say whether all children

who need these health services get served. "There is no way of knowing since it's on a referral basis. But if there are any major needs in this area, they haven't been brought to my attention."

During the four years, local budget funds have provided psychological services and the state program has provided home-school coordinators and nurses. The free breakfast program which was provided prior to 1973-74 by state funds was not in operation during this period.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

Health

The health service provided by Title I is part of a larger health program which has been supported from several sources, including the state program for disadvantaged students and the local Lions Club. If a teacher notices that a child appears to have a medical problem which is interfering with his performance in class, the teacher will refer the child to the state-funded nurse. The nurse will screen the child, and, if referral to a doctor is appropriate, will check the various programs that might pay for the doctor's services. If there is no other program, the nurse will approve an amount for the service and Title I will pay the bill.

At present there is no routine screening provided for Title I children from any source. Before 1976 the state program did screen for sight and hearing problems, and the local Lions Club would provide eyeglasses for children with sight problems detected in the screening (the respondent did not know who had provided hearing aids). The screening program was dropped in 1976 because of budget cuts and personnel losses.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The respondent stated that the goal of his Title I supportive service was to "take care of the medical needs of those children who cannot have it provided through any other source." When asked whether he considered supportive services to be an integral part of an instructional program, he said there is a "problem of evaluating the contribution to academic performance. . .Supportive services are viewed as too far removed from improvements in academic performance."

B. Decision-making Process

Title I planning is a joint responsibility of the Title I coordinator and three assistant coordinators (Early Childhood, Reading, and Parent Involvement). "We look at what teachers, principals and parents are telling us about needs." The coordinator and his assistants also meet with the LEA Elementary Supervisor and the Director of Special Education Programs in the course of Title I planning.

In addition to the formal needs assessment process (see below), parents are brought into the planning process through the PACs. Each participating Title I school has a local PAC made up of parents of Title I children. "Principals have not been too involved with their local PACs and mostly don't come to PAC meetings, which are held several times a year. However, we try to keep parents as informed as we can about what's going on and to get their feedback." The main liaison between the local PACs and the administration is the Parent Involvement Coordinator, who attends all PAC meetings. The respondent stated that it has been hard to get parents to attend these meetings. He and his staff have tried several methods such as calling committees or

combining a PAC meeting with some other function such as a school Christmas party, but with mixed results. There is also a district PAC made up of the chairperson of each local PAC. The relationship between the district PAC and the administration is, again, "an informational kind of thing, trying to get them to understand the program." The administration explains all the details of the program to the District PAC and asks the members to go back to their local councils and explain the program to them. It also asks the members for their suggestions. When the plan is finished, the state requires that the chairperson of the district PAC sign the application, indicating that the parents have been informed about the program and are aware of its components.

The Superintendent of Education, though he offers little input, is informed of the contents of the program and signs the application before it is submitted to the state Title I office. The local school board has not requested that it be informed of the program each year. "Everyone is very supportive."

Explaining the stability of the district's program during the past four years, the respondent said, "There has not been much change from year to year because reading always comes up as our top need, then math. . . By the time we get done taking care of reading, there isn't much left, even for math." The respondent stated that the feedback from parents has always been good and that they have never indicated that they thought the program should go in another direction. Even when supportive services were phased out in 1971-72, there were no complaints. "We more or less said to them that the State is encouraging us to go in this direction and they accepted this."

C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

Needs assessment occurs at three different points. Teachers are the basic source of needs assessment; they are responsible for referring those

students to Title I whom they feel are achieving below grade level in reading and math. This referral is based on the teacher's overall observation of the student and the child's score on a diagnostic test given each year. Actual eligibility for Title I is then determined on the basis of testing which occurs each fall. Second, the principal in each school completes a needs assessment form from his point of view. Lastly, the parents of each Title I child complete a needs assessment form indicating what they feel their child needs as well as what Title I children generally need.

In contrast to the needs assessment process, the evaluation of Title I is limited to statistics, which is what the state asks for--things such as the number of students participating, test scores, and the number of parents involved in PACs. There is no subjective evaluation of the Title I program. As was stated above, one of the reasons why the state encouraged the dropping of supportive services was the difficulty of evaluating their contribution on the basis of objective data.

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

The district has had no problems with state or federal guidelines. "The State has been very cooperative and supportive, and we have not been in disagreement with what they wanted; we have cooperated too. . .We think it should be restrictive; otherwise the money would [end up in general aid]. . . I suppose if we had disagreed with the State and fought for supportive services, we would have had problems, but we didn't disagree with them."

When asked whether, in the years when they provided more Title I supportive services, the district had ever had a problem with the state regarding supplanting, the respondent stated that they had never had such a problem. However, "It was somewhat of a problem in that it was difficult to keep things

absolutely restrictive, although we tried. The problem was not so much with the Title I staff as with the principals who always wanted to expand things to other students, but we were pretty successful" in keeping the programs restrictive.

The respondent mentioned two supportive services he would want to reintroduce if the district were to receive a large increase in its Title I allocation. First, he would like to pick up the home-school coordinators. "We need more direct contact with parents; someone who can spend time visiting them at home." Second, he would like to provide some students with free breakfast. "Kids are coming to school who may not be hungry, but who don't get the proper nutrition; but it's hard to evaluate the need, to put a handle on it. . . it's just a gut feeling you have."

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 6

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74
B. 1974-75
C. 1975-76 and 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF DISTRICT'S SUPPORTIVE SERVICE

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals
B. Decision-Making Process
C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

The district serves a small city of approximately 15,000 and several neighboring towns. The city, which the respondent described as a "bedroom community" to a nearby metropolitan area, is populated largely by business and professional workers. The district's population is almost entirely white; about 1 percent of the district's students are Spanish surnamed and less than 1 percent are black. There are six public schools in the district (four are elementary) and about 3,800 students. There are no private schools in the district, but there is a home for emotionally disturbed children located in the district's attendance area which operates a small Title I program. That program is reported separately in the appendix.

During the period studied, the district has determined the schools eligible for Title I on the basis of a number of poverty indicators, including the number of students taking part in the free breakfast and free lunch programs, the number of children from families receiving AFDC, unpaid book fees, and estimates from teachers about the number of children who are ill-clothed and ill-fed. Each year, the same one school has been found eligible. While the poverty level in the district as a whole is "generally less than 10 percent," almost 45 percent of the children enrolled in the Title I eligible school come from families who are below the poverty level.

Children are selected to participate in Title I instructional programs on the basis of cognitive grade level achievement. (A percentile criterion will be used for the coming year.) In past years, the district selected some participants on the basis of "affective" criteria, but,

because of changed guidelines, no longer does so. All children participating in the instructional program are eligible for the district's one Title I supportive service, a program of guidance and psychological services.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74

This year guidance and psychological services were provided to Title I students in the single Title I school by a psychologist and psychometrician, both of whom were employed on a part-time, contractual basis. Their services included some psychological testing (though local budget funds support a testing program), observations of students in the classroom, counseling sessions with children and/or their parents, and consultation with instructional staff. This service accounted for approximately 12 percent of the district's total allocation for Title I.

B. 1974-75

As in the year before, guidance and psychological services were provided in the single Title I qualifying school. This year, however, only the psychologist was contracted for. The cost of this service again was 12 percent of the total Title I allocation.

C. 1975-76, 1976-77

Guidance and psychological services were provided, as they had been in the past year, in the single Title I school. In 1975-76 the budget for this service was approximately 9 percent of the total Title I budget; in 1976-77 it accounted for approximately 7 percent.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SUPPORTIVE SERVICE

The guidance and psychological services program, which has been in operation in the district throughout the period studied, is provided on a contractual basis to the single Title I school. Through the contractual arrangement the district obtains the services of a local practicing psychologist for thirty-six days during the school year, normally for one day each week at a fee of $125 per day. During the 1973-74 school year the psychologist was assisted by an intern who provided psychometrical services.

In most cases a child who is to receive the services of the psychologist will be referred to the school principal by his regular classroom or Title I teacher. The principal reviews the referrals and schedules those with the most serious need for appointments with the psychologist. Occasionally a child will be referred directly to the psychologist by a teacher or will be selected on the basis of parent recommendations.

The psychologist may refer a child to a local special education program for psychological testing or, if it appears that there will be significant delays in such testing, administer some tests to the child himself. The psychologist may have direct counseling sessions with the child; he may observe the child's behavior in the classroom over a period of weeks. He may meet with the child's parents to discuss the results of tests given, to explain the child's problems, to recommend a schedule for the child, or to suggest ways in which the parents might better deal with the child's behavioral problems and reinforce the efforts being made for the child at school. The psychologist also discusses the child's problem and the ways of dealing with it with the child's teachers. If severe problems are evident, the psychologist may refer the child to the special

education program operated by the district in association with several other nearby districts.

The psychologist currently working in the program customarily counsels children on an individual basis. Counselors who served in earlier years often used small group techniques in working with the children.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The goal of the district's counseling program is to help children whose emotional or behavioral problems interfere with their learning achieve up to the maximum of their intellectual potential. The psychologist is employed for his expertise and understanding of the ways of dealing with such problems, and for his special skills that administrators and teachers as such do not have.

B. Decision-Making Process

Planning for the Title I program in the district gets under way in the spring when the district Title I director attends a state-sponsored workshop on Title I. At the workshop, state officials review the state and federal guidelines, particularly those that have changed, and provide each district with a rough estimate of the funds that will be available for its Title I program for the coming year. On the basis of this information and the suggestions and recommendations of Title I staff and parents in his district, the Title I director, who is also the principal of the Title I school, plans the program for the coming year. Though the Title I director is responsible to the superintendent and to the School Board, they have customarily delegated decision-making power for the Title I program to him. Normally they will approve the proposal without examining its details.

The director does, however, make a special effort to explain the Title I program and its results whenever one of the Board members visits the school. Two of the five members of the Board are opposed in principle to federal programs such as Title I, and "we [the Title I program] live by a 3-2 vote."

Since there have been few major changes in the programs in recent years, the planning of the Title I budget has become a relatively standard procedure. The district first allocates money for its basic continuing programs: amounts are designated for the reading teachers, the math teachers and the psychologist. A small allocation is earmarked for supplies and a few thousand dollars are set aside as a carry over for the following year. What is left over beyond this is used to hire teacher aides. Increases or decreases in the district's allocation are reflected in the number of teacher aides the district is able to hire.

The two groups with which the Title I director works most in preparing the proposal are the staff of the Title I school and the parents of the Title I children. The staff members are, of course, immediately available in the principal/Title I director's school. The district encourages "as many parents as possible to participate in the planning and input that go into the proposal each year," with varying success. There is a core group of about twenty to forty parents who come regularly to the minimum of three or four annual meetings. The meetings are open to all parents in the school, but a minimum of 60 percent of the members of the PAC must be parents of Title I children. The amount of participation from the parents varies, however, at least partly because "people aren't really militant here." Most of the parents are satisfied with the principal and Title I staff and most approve of what Title I is doing: "I think they like the programs we have and they're not anxious to see them dropped or changed."

After discussion with the Title I staff, the director will draw up the district's proposal and present it at a PAC meeting. At the PAC meeting, after reviewing the district's needs and priorities and the planning and budgeting reflected in the new proposal, "we try then to draw out their feelings about what other needs there are or if there is anything that should take precedence over what we've been doing. Then you have to be realistic with them in terms of what will be approved at the state level."

In past years, the parents have suggested that Title I funds be used for additional health services or to maintain a clothing bank, but the district staff felt that these needs could be adequately met by the local budget nurse and by the small clothing bank currently maintained from contributions at no cost to Title I. Though the initial suggestion came from a teacher, the parents played a considerable part in the district's planning of a Title I "transition room," in which "marginal" children performing below grade level but fully capable of performing at or above level, are given intensive instruction to boost them out of Title I and back into the regular classroom. In general, the district "is not opposed to . . . ideas . . . from the PAC, but basically we are limited in that reading and math are the things that are going to get approval, we've been told."

Guidance received at the state workshops has been an important factor in the shaping of the district's Title I program. Several years ago, for example, the state officials reported receiving guidelines from Washington encouraging concentration on primary grades and suggested that the district prepare its proposal accordingly. At other times, the state officials have suggested: "'If you want approval, you'd probably better stick with reading, Number 1'; and then they came along a little later and said 'well, when you get reading taken care of, you can get into

math.' Now reading and math are the two big things. So this is . . . the way its been down the years. . . . reading and math and after that language arts."

Since the district has shaped its program in accordance with the state guidelines, it has had little problem getting its proposals approved. Last year, the district was asked to formalize its relationship with the psychologist and did so with a written contract. Occasionally a new state Title I official will require several rounds of minor revisions on the district's proposal, but "nothing essential changes." The respondent was not aware of any specific state guidelines on the allowable kinds of supportive services or on the amount of its allocation a district might spend on such services. Since the district's spending for the psychological service has remained unchanged over the last few years, the state has had little reason to question it, and the district has no plans to "spend such a large percentage on supportive services as to rock the boat."

C. Evaluation and Needs Assessment

The respondent had no knowledge of the needs assessment on which the original decision to hire the psychologist was based. When the present Title I director took over, the structure and funding for Title I programs were already set up. "Now it is merely a matter of each year reviewing the needs assessment and making whatever changes were indicated by the parent advisory council or by meetings with teachers." But the need for the psychologist, however, remains clear to the Title I director from daily experiences with the children:

> I'm in and out of all of the classrooms every day, and I know the problems that teachers are facing with children who are frustrated and who have deep-seated problems that get in the way of learning.

> Because we're in an economically deprived neighborhood, our children have lots of built-in problems that are not encountered by children in other parts of town. In effect, our children have to be like litle Jeckyls and Hydes--they must constantly be making a change from behavior and language that are acceptable at school to behavior and language that are common to the community, to the neighborhood, to their brothers and sisters. . . . It is a constant change and they have to change personality, change language, change behavior, in order to get along in both places. Often this causes real problems that get in the way of learning.

Expressions of the need for the psychologist also come from teachers, parents, and from the children themselves: "if you're sensitive to children's needs and the ways children respond to situations, you're hearing it from them . . . they are many times crying out for help."

The arrangement for the one-day-a-week services of the psychologist is partly a result of the psychologist's availability but perhaps more importantly a result of the district's limited Title I funds: "This was both all we could afford and all we could get; psychologists of this caliber are hard to come by."

Since no other counseling service is available in the district at the elementary level, "If it were not for Title I funds, we would not be able to offer these services." The need for the psychologist is not confined to the Title I children; others in the school need the services, "but there is no way to provide them." At best the district tries to get some informal advice for dealing with the problems of non-Title I children from the psychologist as he is coming and going.

Evaluation of the program is "totally a subjective kind of thing. There's no way you can put it down in percentages or dollars and cents." The director talks with the child's teacher and with his parents about how the child is doing, how he is responding and cooperating in and out of class, how the suggestions of the psychologist have worked out and, in short, about whether the service is working. The district can point

to examples of children whose behavioral problems were affecting their learning and who, after treatment, showed considerable improvement both socially or behaviorally and academically. It is largely through such examples, where one can see the improvement, that the district determines the utility of the psychological service.

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

The respondent felt that there was only limited need for additional Title I supportive services in the district. There is a school nurse who serves the six schools in the district and whose services are supplemented by a county health nurse who does home visiting and by a doctor retained by the district primarily in an advisory capacity. The district also employs three speech therapists whose duties include providing hearing screenings for all district children. Special education programs provide psychological testing and additional services for children with specific learning handicaps. Local welfare agencies provide some social work services and district funds provide an attendance officer. While the respondent noted that additional psychological services might be useful, he felt that, in general, the local budget services were doing an adequate job and that the special needs of the Title I children were not sufficient to warrant additional Title I supportive service personnel.

> If I had more Title I money, I certainly would find a way to spend it, including some supportive services. But I don't think I would be pushing to get additional supportive services at the top of my needs list. I see my needs now as being greatest in the area of language arts.

Title I children can read and do math because "we have spent our Title I money and efforts on reading and math." Their test scores however, indicate weaknesses in writing skills, in punctuation and spelling--and these are the weaknesses the district would first attack if it were to receive additional Title I money.

In administering its Title I program, the district has encountered some difficulties springing from the restrictiveness of Title I. At times the district staff must explain to parents of non-Title I children why it is that their children cannot receive the special help. The district has seen some children who, after several years in Title I, reach grade level and move into the regular classroom only to fall once again below grade level. And it "does hurt" when the district cannot make the full services of the psychologist available to a needy, non-Title I child: "it's kind of like having a doctor with a child bleeding to death and the doctor can't help him because the child isn't eligible for help."

The respondent mentioned two reactions to state and federal administration of Title I: "Basically we get two impressions. One is they don't trust us. The other is that they aren't educators. We need people to trust one another down the line, and have a clear line of responsibility," so that if someone doesn't perform properly, he can be held accountable. "But we don't need all of this red tape and all of this paper and all of the time and energy expended in writing and revising our proposal when ultimately, it doesn't change one iota of what we're going to do here with these children."

The respondent also mentioned some dissatisfaction with the increased emphasis in recent years on cognitive criteria for selection of Title I children, an emphasis that has forced the district to drop children from its program who were reading at grade level but who were "extremely culturally deprived, who needed all kinds of help in the affective areas." Use of the affective criteria to select Title I children had also enabled the district to emphasize preventive measures in its program, concentrating services to keep children from falling below grade level. Now the district feels it must wait until a child has fallen below grade level before it can take steps to help him.

VI. APPENDIX

In addition to the Title I program offered in the one public school in the district, there is also a small Title I program in operation in a church-related home for emotionally disturbed children (dependent and neglected) within the district. Children living at the home attend the regular district public schools, but those taking part in the program return to the home for Title I instruction in reading and math. Approximately half of the eighty children now in residence at the home receive Title I instruction either in a classroom setting or through tutoring. Title I funds are sufficient to cover only about half of the costs of this instructional program: Title I pays the salary of two teachers. The salary for an additional teacher and money for supplies and materials are supplied from institutional funds.

The coordinator of the Title I program at the home works with the director of the local district program in preparing the home's application for Title I funds. The home's application is appended to that of the district for submission to the state, but the home operates its own program and receives its allocation separate from that of the district. Children residing at the home become eligible for Title I services on the basis of achievement test scores, teacher referrals, and case worker recommendations.

Prior to the 1974-75 school year the home offered supportive services as part of its Title I program. These services, in which all children in the home participated, included sports and craft activities and field trips supervised by a coordinator whose salary was paid from Title I funds. The program was dropped following the 1973-74 school year as a result of a drop in the home's Title I allocation and because of guidance from the

state emphasizing the priority of reading and math programs. The respondent indicated that while state officials did not expressly disapprove the home's supportive services program, they did convey the impression that it would be very difficult to obtain approval for it. Since, with the reduction in its funding, the home had to make some cuts in its Title I program, it decided to eliminate the supportive services component. Since that time it has supported recreational and enrichment activities from institutional funds.

As a residential home for children with special needs, the institution provides a number of services not regularly provided by a public school system. It provides health services through a nearby doctor and his nurse, refers children with vision problems to a local opthalmologist, has a consultant psychologist and psychiatrist, and maintains a staff of eight psychiatric social workers. When admitted to the home every child receives a full battery of psychological tests, with further tests administered each year thereafter. Although the home presently has no Title I-funded supportive services, it does consider such services a crucial part of its full program. In a situation where the students do not leave for home after school hours, "we're obligated to provide a wide range of services. . ." including the kinds of recreational and enrichment activities formerly offered under Title I. "Obviously we think that they're just as important as instructional services, because we're still continuing them and have always had them."

The home currently has two persons on the staff involved in coordinating the recreational program, but would hire an additional person if sufficient Title I funds were available and it could get the request approved. When asked whether the state's attitude toward supportive services might

have changed in the last few years, the respondent remarked that the state remains concerned with "accountabilility," with being able to account for expenditures in terms of actual results measured against stated expectations. "It all revolves around being able to show that a youngster has gained so much in reading or math. Those things are easy. The accountability for whether the youngster gains much from playing softball with mature adults is a little harder to measure." He noted that in evaluations of its earlier supportive service program the home had relied on case history narratives of the experiences provided for the children, the children's improvements in social relationships and their progress in relating the enrichment experiences to other events and activities. He added that while he was aware that "ways to measure these subjective kinds of things" have been developed, the home had not attempted to use such measures for its recreational/enrichment program.

In response to a closing question about difficulties he had experienced in working with Title I programs, the respondent remarked that he had found Title I among the easier federal programs to deal with, but he attributed this in part to the assistance provided by the Title I director in the local school district.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY #7

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

- A. 1973-74
- B. 1974-75
- C. 1975-76
- D. 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

- A. Health
- B. Guidance
- C. Psychology
- D. Social Work
- E. Library
- F. Speech Therapy
- G. Clothing
- H. Attendance Counseling

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Goals
- B. Decision-making and needs assessment
- C. Evaluation

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PLANS, AND PROBLEMS

I. Introduction and Highlights

The district, which came into being with the consolidation of two separate districts (hereinafter referred to as Districts I and II) in 1975, serves a central city and its suburbs with a combined population of 700,000. Fourteen percent of the district's population is black; the remainder is white.

In the years covered by this report, 1973-74 through 1976-77, there has been a steady decrease in both the number of public schools and the public school enrollment and a less than corresponding increase in the number of private schools and private school enrollment. Currently there are 154 public and 98 private schools serving the district, with enrollments of 120,000 and 29,000, respectively, and a combined enrollment of nearly 150,000. These current figures represent a loss of 13 public schools and 19,000 students enrolled in public schools and an increase of 17 private schools and 5,000 students enrolled in non-public schools since the 1973-74 school year.

During the study period, both districts and later the combined district have used the Free Lunch Program count to determine which public schools would be eligible for Title I funds. Any attendance area which has a percentage of low-income families higher than the district average is determined eligible. In addition, those schools which had been eligible prior to consolidation because of a low average in one district continue to be eligible under Federal guidelines despite the higher average of the consolidated district. In 1976-77, a year after the consolidation, the district average was 30 percent, but schools eligible under the carryover provision had percentages as low as 14 percent. In this same year, 70 public schools were Title I designated schools.

Busing of public school children to achieve integration began in the fall of 1976. However, busing has not affected the number of public schools

receiving Title I funds. The respondent stated that "if a child resides in an eligible attendance area but is bused to a non-eligible attendance area, the child is not eligible for Title I funds."

Non-public schools are not themselves eligible for Title I programs, but they can participate in the Title I program if there are students in the school who come from a Title I eligible attendance area and meet the Title I criteria for student eligibility. However, not all the non-public schools with Title I eligible children have wanted to participate in the program, "possibly because of Federal guidelines such as those that require that there be no discrimination in enrollment policies." In 1976-77 there were 23 non-public schools that were participating in Title I programs.

During the four-year study period, there has not been much change in the supportive services actually offered in the district, but after consolidation, the source of funding changed from Title I to local budget funds in several cases.

Prior to consolidation, District I used Title I funds to operate most of the supportive service programs in its schools: Title I funds supported health, guidance and psychology, and clothing services in both the public and non-public schools; library and attendance services in the public schools only; and social work and speech therapy programs in the non-public schools only. These Title I supportive services were for the most part limited to those schools offering the instructional program of which the supportive service was an integral component; only the clothing and health services were provided to all Title I public schools and participating non-public schools. District I used local budget funds only for a few supportive service programs such as social work and speech

therapy in its public schools. During this same period, District II used local budget funds to provide a wide range of supportive service programs and used Title I funds only to provide health, social work and clothing services in 1974-75.

After consolidation, the programs that had previously been offered in one district under Title I and in the other district under local budget funds were now provided to the combined district out of local budget funds. For example, District II had provided guidance counseling through local budget funds whereas District I had used Title I funds for this program. After consolidation, local budget funds provided counselors for the entire district. However, there are several Title I funded supportive service programs still in effect. Title I continues to provide clothing and limited health service programs in participating public and non-public schools, and social work and guidance and psychology services in non-public schools only.

II. Chronological Narrative

A. 1973-74

During this year there were two districts serving the area now served by the one, consolidated district. District I provided eight supportive services from Title I funds to both public and non-public schools, though some services were available only in public schools, others only in private schools. District II, on the other hand, provided no supportive services from Title I funds this year, because "I assume that they [District II officials] felt that local budget funds were providing sufficient support services."

Title I funded supportive services provided in District I included:

--health services in both public and non-public schools. In the forty-four Title I public schools health services included screening

for hearing and sight problems and the provision of eyeglasses and hearing aids. In the 10 participating private schools hearing and sight screening was provided by other means; Title I funds provided only the corrective equipment.

--clothing services in all 44 Title I public schools and in the 10 participating non-public schools.

--guidance counseling in 10 eligible public schools and in the 10 participating non-public schools. Each public school had a full time counselor; two counselors distributed their time among the private schools.

--psychological services in 14 public schools. (This was an educational service for Title I teachers in special instructional programs, not a direct service to Title I students.)

--library services in 30 Title I public schools, which supported a half-time librarian and half-time library clerk in each school.

--attendance services in 7 Title I public schools, with a full-time attendance counselor for each school, as part of a special reading instructional program.

--social work services in the 10 participating private schools.

--speech therapy services in the 10 participating private schools.

B. 1974-75

During this year District I's Title I budget remained the same as the year before. And, except for three curtailed services, the same range of supportive services was offered in the district's schools. The supportive services which were dropped this year included:

--attendance services in the 7 public schools which had offered the special reading instructional program. Attendance counseling in these schools was an integral part of this program, and when it was dropped this year because "it was not effective," the attendance services were also dropped and were not picked up by another program.

--the psychological services in 14 public schools, dropped for "budgetary reasons."

--the social work service in the 10 private schools. This supportive service was cut by the district's central planning committee in spite of positive evaluations by all concerned, including the principals. "Apparently this decision was made because it was felt that the funds could be better spent elsewhere." In order to compensate for this loss, the guidance counselors in the non-public schools took on some of the duties of the social workers.

In addition to these cuts, the number of health aides serving the public schools was reduced from three to two, also for "budgetary reasons."

Since there was no general reduction in the Title I budget, the money made available by these cuts in the Title I supportive service programs must have gone into instructional programs, though the respondent was unable to explain what specific instructional programs benefited.

District II offered Title I-funded supportive services in the areas of health, social work, and clothing in its Title I eligible public schools only. These services were provided by two nurses and two social workers, respectively.

C. 1975-76

This year was the first year of consolidation of the two districts, and was marked by a reduction in the overall Title I budget and a shift from Title I to local budget funds for many of the supportive services offered in the public schools. The Title I budget for the consolidated district was approximately $4,400,000--$1,300,000 less than the combined budgets for the preceding year. However, the main change in support services this year resulted not from these Title I budget cuts but rather from an expansion of local budget funding brought by the consolidation.

Prior to consolidation, each district provided certain services out of Title I funds which the other provided out of local budget funds. Due to regulations against supplanting and the requirement of comparability, the consolidated district had a choice of not providing any of these services or providing them to schools across the district. They chose the latter option. Thus, the guidance counseling and library programs in District I's public schools and District II's social work program in its public schools were dropped from Title I funding and taken over by

local budget funds. The health aides were replaced by volunteer services. As a result, the only supportive service programs provided in the public schools from Title I funds this year were clothing and a limited health program which provided hearing aids and eyeglasses. When asked whether Title I children have special or extra needs or whether their needs were being adequately met, the respondent said that all indications were that their needs were being met by local budget personnel: "since they give the most service to those children who need it most, and since Title I children obviously need the service most, their needs would be the first to be met."

The Title I funded supportive services offered in the private schools of the consolidated district were basically the same as those provided in the private schools of District I in 1974-75. These included the provision of hearing aids and eyeglasses, clothing, guidance, and speech therapy (which had its personnel reduced by one). In addition, professional social work services (which were dropped in 1974-75) were reinstated in 9 non-public schools.

D. 1976-77

This year--the second year of consolidation--the district's Title I budget was cut by $1,400,000. However, the supportive services provided in the district's public and private schools were identical to those provided the year before, except that the speech therapy program in the private schools was dropped altogether, and the guidance and social work programs in the private schools was expanded to 21 schools (with no increase in personnel).

III. Description of Supportive Services

A. Health

Prior to consolidation, District I provided hearing aids and eyeglasses in all Title I public schools and participating non-public schools.

In addition, 3 Title I health assistants (2 in 1974-75) provided screening for hearing and visual problems in the Title I public schools only; the non-public schools used volunteers from local professional organizations to screen students. District II provided some sort of Title I health program in its Title I public schools in 1974-75, though specific information is not available; the program employed two nurses.

After consolidation, the Title I health program in all schools was reduced to providing hearing aids and eyeglasses. Screening became a totally volunteer effort.

B. Guidance

Guidance and counseling services were provided in a limited number of the Title I public schools in District I prior to consolidation. In 1973-74 and 1974-75 these services were available in the ten Title I public schools in District I which offered the Reading and Language Arts (later Diagnostic Prescriptive Individualized Reading) program. Only students in this program were eligible for counseling services. No targeting of students within this eligible group was necessary.

One counselor was assigned to each of the ten schools participating in this reading program. Using the techniques of individual and group counseling, the program helped Title I students who had adjustment and attendance problems overcome these difficulties by developing self-discipline and motivation.

In addition, counselors worked to increase contact between parents and the school. If a child was "troubled," he was referred to appropriate persons or agencies. Counselors also consulted with classroom teachers on a regular basis. After consolidation in 1975, this program was shifted from Title I to local budget funds in the public schools.

Similar guidance services were offered to Title I children in the private schools in District I in 1973-74. However, in this setting, each counselor formed a team with a social worker. There were two teams, each of which worked with children in four schools on a regularly scheduled basis and in one school on an on-call basis. In 1974-75, the scope of the counselor's work increased with the dropping of the social work program in the private schools. In addition to their other tasks, the counselors now had more contact with parents regarding the students' needs and they contacted health and social agencies for referral of students needing such services. With the return of the social work program in 1975-76, this program once again operates as it did in 1973-74, except there is a greater emphasis upon individual counseling.

C. Psychology

The limited psychology program which was in operation during 1973-74 in 14 of the Title I public schools in District I was not a service provided directly to students. The single, half-time psychologist was connected with public school programs for children with emotional disorders, and educable mentally handicapped and trainable mentally handicapped children. His task was to educate Title I teachers so that they would be able to deal with the problems with which they were confronted. He first held workshops in each area. After the workshops, each teacher was involved in a practical learning experience during which the psychologist reviewed all procedures and analyses used by the teacher. After the teachers' competence was established, the psychologist functioned in a consultant role to the teachers. This program was dropped in 1974-75.

D. Social Work

In District I, social work services were only provided by Title I in the non-public schools. Social work services in the public schools were

provided by local budget funds. In 1973-74 each social worker formed a team with a guidance counselor, with the social worker serving as the main liaison between the schools and the home. She interviewed parents about the family and social problems of the children; helped school personnel better understand the needs of individual students; and kept parents informed about the schools' instructional and supportive service programs. In general, the social worker's task was to insure that the student could and would use the educational program to its fullest extent. This program was dropped in 1974-75, but was reinstated in 1975-76 and has been in continuous operation in the non-public schools since consolidation.

A Title I social work program was in operation in the public schools of District II in 1974-75, but it was shifted to local budget funding after consolidation.

E. Library

Prior to consolidation, Title I library services were provided only in those public schools in District I which offered a Title I reading program. In 1973-74, there were 30 half-time librarians and 30 half-time library clerks in 30 public schools. In 1974-75 the number of clerks, librarians, and participating schools each increased to 33. The Title I library program was designed to reinforce what was learned in the reading programs by more personal contact with students. The librarian conferred with the reading specialist and classroom teacher regarding the special reading skills needs of each DPI primary pupil. The librarian then scheduled special time for these children to work with the media center to improve various skills, such as appreciation of literature; listening skills (including retelling of a story in sequence, describing the mood of a story, describing the story characters, selecting the main ideas and supportive details); and reference skills, for example, determining what book to use to find certain information using library cards. Library clerks dealt primarily with materials,

their purpose being to free the librarians' time for more direct student contact. This service was taken over by local budget funds after consolidation.

F. Speech Therapy

A speech therapy program, connected with the Diagnostic Prescriptive Individualized Reading program in 10 participating private schools, was in operation in District I in 1973-76. The speech therapists worked closely with the Title I reading teachers, who referred students for treatment to the speech therapists. After consolidation in 1975-76, the staff was cut from three speech therapists to two. This year the program has been dropped altogether and has not been picked up by local budget funds.

G. Clothing

A Title I funded clothing program has been in continuous operation in the district during the four year study period. Prior to consolidation, all eligible Title I public schools and participating private schools in District I offered such services; since consolidation, all eligible public and participating private schools in the consolidated district offer a clothing program. Under this program, children participating in any Title I program are eligible to receive clothing from Title I funds. Teachers or principals make referrals to the central Title I office. That office's responsibility is to make sure that all alternative means of acquiring clothing are explored. If there is no other way, clothing is provided by Title I funds.

H. Attendance Counseling (Home-School Coordinators)

This service was provided to Title I children participating in a special reading program in the public schools in District I in 1973-74. There was one Home-School Coordinator in each of the seven participating schools. These Coordinators were paraprofessionals who in most cases

came from the community with which they dealt. They were in contact with both the project teacher and the parents in an effort to encourage attendance and participation in the program. The children who received this service were selected because they had the poorest attendance records of all the children participating in the reading project. This attendance service was dropped in 1974-75 when the reading project it supported was discontinued.

IV. Planning and Evaluation

A. Goals

The goal of supportive service programs is to "clear up or eliminate problems that would interfere with the success of the instructional program, that would keep the child from learning." As a side benefit, which in turn reinforces the main goal, the respondent felt that supportive services help the child develop a better self image.

B. Decision-Making and Needs Assessment

The process of needs assessment and planning for supportive services has been the same in both Districts I and II prior to consolidation and in the consolidated district. The process can only be understood in the context of overall program planning for Title I since most supportive services have been written in as part of a particular instructional program or group of programs. For instance, the speech therapy services, provided in the private schools until this year, were part of the DPIR instructional program in those schools. Only the clothing and health programs have not been limited to children participating in a particular instructional group.

The first step in the planning process is the setting of priorities. "In a general sense, the Federal government has already determined that reading and math are the top priorities and the district is in full agreement with that determination." However, within those general constraints, the district generally reestablishes its specific priorities each year.

For example, for the next year the priorities are: (1) Reading and Language Arts for grades 1 - 6; (2) Math for grades 3 - 6; and (3) Math for grades 1 - 2. In the case of some long-range programs, priorities are set and reviewed every two or three years.

Priorities are established by a central committee composed of the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Secondary Education (who has primary responsibility for instructional programs), the Director of Reading, the Director of Early Childhood Education, the principals, the District PAC (composed of the chairman of each local PAC, in both public and non-public schools), and the Title I Coordinator. Priorities are based primarily on test data which show where the greatest need is as well as where the greatest effect is likely to be. In addition, informal assessments by Title I parents and principals and by non-Title I elementary supervisors are used. The respondent felt that the assessment of elementary supervisors is very important. "They have a view of the whole instructional setup, not just Title I, and they can see how well we are providing for the needs of our children. They can also verify the accuracy of our test data."

Parents are brought into the decision-making process in several ways. First, there is some interaction between the local PAC's and the principals, although the extent of cooperation "varies considerably." Second, one elementary principal is an ex officio member of the District PAC, thus creating a line of communication between parents and principals. Finally, the chairman of each local PAC represents his local constituency on the District PAC and is involved in all major planning decisions.

Once the priorities have been established, particular instructional programs are selected, again on the basis of test data and informal assessments. Subsequently, the decision on supportive services is made on the basis of what service, if any, is felt to be required for successful

implementation of these instructional programs. Funds for each supportive service come out of the total budget for each specific program.

The public and non-public school systems go through initially separate processes of needs assessment and planning. After both school systems have made an original work-up of their needs, both go through the central committee. In this way the public school representatives help determine the non-public school program and the non-public school representatives help determine the public school program

C. Evaluation

Programs are evaluated on the basis of test data and informal assessments by various individuals and groups. The decision to drop the attendance counseling services connected with the special reading project in District I's public schools in 1973-74 shows how this process works. After comparing the performance of children in several reading programs over time, the committee decided on the basis of test scores and informal assessments that the approach represented by this special project wasn't working. Therefore, the project, including the attendance counseling services that were an integral part of it, was dropped and the money was channeled into other programs.

V. Summary: Impressions, Plans and Problems

The respondent believes the district's supportive service programs are adequate.

> I don't hear a lot of clamor for supportive services in connection with out Title I programs. All services which we feel are important are being provided out of Title I or local budget funds. Of course, it would be nice to have even more counselors, but it really isn't necessary given our other priorities. Title I still provides the things which directly affect either the child's ability to attend school or to reap the benefits of instruction, i.e., eyeglasses, hearing aids and clothing. All the other services are still being adequately provided to Title I children out of general funds

> because general fund personnel also deal with those children who need the service most, and they are obviously the Title I children.

According to the respondent's assessment, there have been few supportive services that have been "cut"--only the funding source has changed. Those that have been cut have been small in scope and are not missed.

The district has had no problems with state or federal guidelines; they have not been the cause of any cuts. Since the district has always been very careful about monitoring who receives Title I services, the respondent also stated that there definitely would be no problems with the state should the district decide to supplement local budget supportive services with more intensive services under Title I.

I. Introduction and Highlights

The district is located in an urban area with a population of 200,000. The 55 public schools in the district serve approximately 40,000 students, a number that has decreased by several thousand during the four year period studied. Non-public schools in the district attendance area serve an additional 3,000 students. Nearly 30 percent of the district's students are from low-income families; in some of the district's schools, the figure is as high as 80 percent. Some 45 percent of the students are from racial or ethnic minorities, with a particularly large concentration of Mexican-Americans; at one time over 1,500 students were enrolled in the district's bilingual education programs.

Each year the district selects its Title I target schools on the basis of the free lunch count. Those schools having the highest percentage of economically disadvantaged students are designated as Title I schools. Supportive service personnel are allocated among the Title I schools having the highest proportions of economically disadvantaged students. During the period studied (1973-74 through 1976-77 school years) the district has offered as many as five supportive services, including health, guidance, social work, attendance, and food services. The food program has been operated in all Title I schools, while the remaining services have been distributed to as many of the Title I schools as funds allow. This year, all Title I schools offer at least some of the ancillary services; in past years, because of variations in the number of Title I schools and in the number of supportive service personnel, some schools with the smaller Title I programs have not offered the ancillary services. Four of the non-public schools in the district do participate in Title I instructional activities, but offer no supportive services and they are not included in the various figures reported here.

In the schools offering supportive services, all students participating in Title I instructional programs are eligible to receive services. Children served range in grade from pre-kindergarten through sixth grade, and although the district has no policy of concentrating its services on particular grades within that range, some de facto concentration of health services on the lower grades (pre-kindergarten through third grade) does result from the higher frequency of need among the younger students.

During the summers the district has offered a limited program of health and free lunch services. These programs were not discussed during the interview and are not included in the totals reported for the operation of the supportive services during the regular school year.

Many of the changes that occurred in the district's supportive services programs during the four year period resulted from a plan, implemented by the district in the 1973-74 school year, to concentrate Title I resources--both instructional and supportive services--on two selected target schools. These two schools, identified as having the highest proportion of economically disadvantaged children in the district, became the focus for a "completely different approach to instruction . . ." and a target for a program in which "we were really going to give it our all." Because of the extremely high proportion of disadvantaged children in these schools, the district was able to obtain permission to treat all students in these schools as eligible for Title I. Special supervisory and instructional personnel were assigned to the schools; staff for the schools participated in a special "human relations" training program; supportive services personnel were concentrated in the schools. The program based on this "critical mass" approach proved highly successful in reaching its primary goal of raising achievement test scores.

As a result of this success, however, in the following year the two target schools had fewer children whose achievement level made them eligible for Title I; when Title I could no longer serve all students in the schools, "it put a crimp in the entire curriculum program . . . the whole way it was set up and planned." The district decided that it could not maintain such a concentration of effort; it continued the program on a limited basis during the 1974-75 school year and discontinued it altogether in 1975-76. As the "critical mass" approach was phased out, the district spread its instructional and supportive services programs more evenly over the Title I schools. Thus the history of supportive services in the district over the past four years--the initial concentration on two schools and subsequent dispersion--is largely a reflection of the history of the district's "critical mass" instructional program.

II. Chronological Narrative

A. 1973-74

During the 1973-74 school year the district began its 'critical mass' program of concentrating as densely as possible both instructional and supportive services in two target schools. A guidance counselor was hired to serve these two schools; a nurse and visiting teacher were assigned there; one of the health/attendance aides, who were hired this year for the first time, was assigned to assist the nurse. Three nurses, three health/attendance aides, and three visiting teachers provided supportive services at nine other Title I schools. The free breakfast program was offered in all Title I schools this year.

In at least one other significant respect, the supportive services program offered during the 1973-74 school year differed from that of previous years. Since the beginning of the Title I program in 1966 the district had

provided funding for library/media center aides in the libraries of Title I schools. As of the beginning of the 1973-74 school year this program was discontinued on the advice of state Title I officials on the grounds that the district could not adequately implement the requirement that the services of these aides be provided exclusively to Title I children. This development was not completely unexpected by the district. After reviewing this and similar programs in other districts in previous years the state had apprised the district of the possible difficulties involved and it consulted with the district on the decision to eliminate the program.

B. 1974-75

It was during this year that the district began phasing out its 'critical mass' program in the two target schools. As the respondent explained: " . . . you know, in Title I you're only supposed to serve the children who meet the educational criteria. Well, we made some gains and we were not able to serve every child in these schools the next year and we had to cut out some of the money that was going into those schools. . ." For the supportive services, the most noticeable result of the abandonment of the critical mass approach was the loss of the guidance counselor. The person who had served as Title I counselor in 1973-74 resigned to accept a local budget counseling position; thus, at a time when it was considering ways of redistributing Title I funds among its Title I schools, the district faced a decision on whether to seek a replacement for the Title I counselor. Although the counseling program had been considered generally successful, the district decided not to hire a new counselor: "We didn't feel the contribution of one counselor was going to make or break what we were doing . . . You know, with a counselor . . . you've got to have an awful lot of them to make an impact" because they work with individuals or with relatively small groups.

". . . I don't know how we could have gone on justifying just one counselor. We would have had to go in with a whole lot more counselors,"--but the money was not available.

Some concentration of the other ancillary services (health, attendance, social work), continued in 1974-75. The four nurses, each of whom served two schools; the four health/attendance aides, each of whom served in one of the schools with a nurse; and four visiting teachers, each of whom served two schools, were distributed through ten Title I schools so that the three schools with the highest concentrations of Title I students had three service personnel, four of the schools with next highest concentration had two personnel, and three schools had one person assigned. Three schools with small Title I programs had no supportive service personnel.

The major change in the budget for food services this year resulted from the change in eligibility rules for the federal Free Lunch Program. Throughout the program, all students participating in Title I instructional services have received free breakfasts. But, as noted in the description of the services below, some had received it not through their status as Title I students, but because their family's income fell below the federal standard for eligibility in the food subsidy programs. When, in 1974-75, this income standard was raised, many more Title I students became directly eligible for the food subsidies and the share of the food program that was paid from Title I funds fell considerably. While in 1973-74 over $63,000 was allocated for Title I food services, in 1974-75 the figure was only about $11,000.

C. 1975-76

This year the district was able to increase the number of schools offering compensatory education instructional services from the 13 of the preceding year to 19 schools. This extension of instructional services to new schools was made possible by an allocation of state compensatory education funds; the funds were not used, however, to extend supportive services.

It was during this year that the 'critical mass' approach to compensatory education was dropped completely. For the supportive services, this meant that services personnel were spread more evenly over the Title I schools with several additional schools receiving services. The four nurses provided health services at eight schools, being assisted at four of the schools by health/attendance aides. Three visiting teachers provided social work services at an additional six schools. One visiting teacher position became vacant this year and was not filled. The district has found that the non-professional health/attendance aides are able to provide most of the services currently offered by the professionally certified visiting teachers. Although currently the aides work only under the supervision of the Title I nurses and thus are not stationed in the schools served by the visiting teachers, the district is giving consideration to further expanding the role of the aides. Specifically, they are considering phasing out the positions for visiting teachers and replacing them with additional positions for the aides. Such a shift would enable the district to provide essentially the same kinds of services at considerable savings in personnel costs (the salary for a visiting teacher is approximately $14,000; for the health/attendance aide it is approximately $6,000.).

Title I funds for food services were reduced once again this year, to approximately $5,300. When asked if it was possible to identify any additions to services made possible from savings in the reduced food services budget or from the salary of the visiting teacher position that was not filled, the respondent replied that it was not possible to identify specific items, that a completely new budget is prepared each year. Among the areas where the funds would most likely have been spent, however, the respondent did mention increased salaries, increased costs for materials and supplies, and a computer assisted instructional program that was introduced that year.

D. 1976-77

The health, social work, and attendance services are operating this year relatively unchanged from 1975-76. The four nurses, four health/attendance aides, and three visiting teachers provide the same services as in previous years at a total of 12 Title I schools. The most significant change this year has occurred in the food program. Because of further changes in the eligibility rules for the free lunch subsidy, no Title I funds have been allocated for the free breakfast program this year. The only remaining food service in the district's Title I program is a limited snack service which serves about 40 children in two pre-kindergarten classes.

III. Description of Services

A. Health Services

This service has been offered throughout the period studied by four registered nurses, each of whom serves two Title I schools. They are assigned to the eight Title I schools with the "highest concentration of economic deprivation" (the one exception to this rule is that two schools are skipped because they are staffed with a Follow-Through nurse; the Title I nurses thus are assigned to eight of the ten schools with highest proportion of economically disadvantaged students.) The Title I nurses are supervised by the local budget consultant for nursing services.

The principal duties of the Title I nurses include conducting vision and dental screenings for Title I children, providing health, nutrition, and hygiene instruction for Title I children and their parents, making referrals for Title I children with specific health related problems, tending to medical emergencies in the schools served, taking Title I children who become ill at school to their homes, making house calls on Title I children who are absent

from school because of illness, and providing consultation to parents and Title I staff on health-related problems that contribute to absenteeism.

In addition to the Title I and Follow-Through nurses, some nursing services are provided to schools throughout the district--including the Title I schools--through local budget funds. The great difference between Title I and local budget nursing services is "concentration." The local budget nurses are still scheduled "on the same basis that they were long ago," that is, before Title I. Local budget nurses have, however, been spread quite thin; in the past it sometimes took several days before one could respond to a health problem (other than genuine emergencies) at a particular school; on a regular basis they could provide little more than routine hearing and vision screenings. Title I nurses, by contrast, have only the Title I children in two schools to serve and thus can provide health and nutritional instruction, arrange referrals, and do follow-up work beyond what is possible for the local budget nurses. The Title I nurses can also, through home visits, provide some basic health education services for the parents of Title I children. Where previously, screenings conducted by local budget nurses might not be completed for the Title I children until well into the school year, screenings by the Title I nurses can be done at the beginning of the year to allow early detection of problems in the Title I students. Though the Title I health program is provided specifically for children who are participating in the Title I instructional programs, it does on occasion provide some services for non-Title I children, as, for example, in the case of emergencies or when a health education or nutrition class is given in a predominately Title I classroom that happens to include some non-targeted children. The respondent indicated that the work of the Title I and local budget nurses is coordinated through the consultant for nursing services, but did not have specific information on how this coordination is effected.

B. Health/Attendance Aides

This service is provided by non-professionals. Typically, the aides live in the local community around the Title I schools they serve, they are of the same racial or ethnic group as the majority of the children in those schools, and they thus share or are well acquainted with the problems of the parents and students in the area. Largely at the suggestion of the school principals, they were originally hired in conjunction with the implementation of the 'critical mass' program to serve as attendance aides. Their primary duty was to check with classroom teachers each morning to determine which Title I children were absent, to contact the parents of these children to determine the reasons for the absences, and to work with the parents to get the children back into school--in general working to reduce absenteeism. Over time the aides' duties have been expanded so that they now serve as assistants to the Title I nurses, performing many of the routine services that do not require professional training. Each aide serves only one school and is supervised in his health related duties by the Title I nurse assigned to that school and in his attendance related duties by the school principal. No comparable service is provided from local budget sources.

C. Social Work Service

This service is provided by persons certified as classroom teachers and as counselors under the supervision of the district's local budget director of developmental services. Each of these "visiting teachers" normally serves two Title I schools. In keeping with the district's aim of providing some ancillary supportive services in as many of the Title I schools as possible, the visiting teachers are assigned to those Title I schools with the highest proportions of economically disadvantaged students which are not served by a Title I nurse. Their principal duties include, as their title suggests,

visiting the homes of Title I children, acting as liaisons between home and school, educating parents to ways they can help their children in school, determining family needs and making referrals to appropriate agencies for welfare services, and performing the attendance services provided at other Title I schools by the health/attendance aides. Though, incidentally, they are certified as teachers, they do not regularly provide any tutorial instruction for Title I children in their homes. Classroom teacher referrals provide the most frequent stimulus for home visits.

D. Guidance Counseling Serivce

This service was provided specifically for students participating in the Title I instructional programs only during the 1973-74 school year. That year the district Title I program hired one counselor, a person who had been teaching in a regular classroom within the district but who had previously served as a counselor outside the district and who had a Master's degree in counseling. This counselor was stationed to serve the two target schools in the "critical mass" program; the services provided consisted primarily of in-school counseling for individuals and small groups of Title I children with emotional problems or problems of social adjustment. During the 1973-74 school year, as in other years, the district provided some limited counseling services, available to all children in the district, from other funding sources.

E. Food Service

There have been two parts to the food service program. The larger has been a free breakfast program; the other much smaller part, has been a program providing snacks to children in the Title I pre-kindergarten program. There are no personnel hired specifically for either part of the Title I food program. The school district operates a large central kitchen facility at which all meals are prepared for shipment to schools participating in free breakfast and

free lunch programs. This kitchen is funded from several sources, particularly the federal Free Lunch Program. The share funded by Title I--a figure that includes the cost of food, kitchen operation, and personnel--is determined by the director of the food services program and billed to Title I. The Title I share of the food services budget is determined by multiplying the cost per meal by the number of children participating in Title I instructional programs who are not directly eligible for free food because their family income exceeds the federally determined limit for eligibility in the free food program. All Title I children are eligible for free breakfasts, but Title I funds are used to pay only for the service received by those Title I children who, except for their participation in Title I instructional programs, would not be eligible for it. In recent years, the family income limit that determines direct eligibility for the free food programs has increased; more and more Title I children have become directly eligible for the food subsidy, and thus the Title I food budget has decreased. During the 1976-77 school year, in fact, no Title I funds have been budgeted for the free breakfast program.

The smaller, pre-kindergarten snack program is operated by the classroom teachers, who buy the food supplies for the two pre-kindergarten classes and are reimbursed from Title I funds.

IV. Program Planning and Evaluation

A. Goals of the Supportive Services

The physical, emotional, and social problems of disadvantaged students often lead to irregular attendance at school or detract from their ability to learn while at school, and thus contribute to the students' low academic achievement. Thus, while the overall goal of the Title I program is to improve

the academic achievement of targeted students, the specific, instrumental goal of the supportive services is to serve those needs of targeted students which prevent their regular attendance at school or their full participation in the instructional programs. More simply, as stated by the respondent with respect to the health services, the goal of the service is "to provide proper health care in order to keep the children in school so they can benefit from the instructional programs."

B. Decision-Making

Major decisions on supportive services are made during the spring of each school year when the district prepares its Title I proposal for the following year. The state informs the district of its total Title I funding allocation, but, beyond the principle that the primary emphasis of Title I programs must be on compensatory instruction, sets no specific guidelines on the amount or the proportion of the district's funds that may be spent on supportive services. The state does provide technical assistance and the district frequently consults with state officials as questions arise during the planning process.

Preparation of the proposal is largely the responsibility of the Title I Coordinator and the Director of Special Programs, but input for the planning is solicited from a number of sources: principals, Title I services providers (including the records maintained by providers on services offered during the year), local budget teachers, and the PAC. Recommendations are gathered both formally, at a series of planning meetings, and informally, through contacts with the various persons involved in the program. In developing the proposal, the district first outlines the programs--both instructional and supportive services--it would like to offer, "and then we put a pencil to it. . decisions have to be made: do we cut programs or do we cut schools. . . That's made by the principals, the people upstairs, us here, the PAC. . . we have to figure a long time on the money."

In planning specific instructional and supportive services for particular schools, the district concentrates first on those schools with the highest poverty index, that is, those with the highest percentage of economically disadvantaged students. Instructional programs and services that will serve at least 80 percent of the eligible students in these schools (this eligibility being determined by achievement scores) must be allocated before planning shifts to other schools taken in turn in order of their poverty ranking. Planning continues in this way until the budget is exhausted, programs for the worse off schools being settled before the programs for the next one on the poverty index are considered. Decisions on new programs or new services for a particular school must be balanced against the requirement to provide the requisite level of services in other schools.

Decisions on supportive services are made with a view to providing at least some services in as many Title I schools as possible, with concentration (e.g., a health/attendance aide to assist the Title I nurse) in schools with the highest poverty ranking. In recent years, planning for the supportive services has been largely a matter of allocating or reallocating existing personnel to the schools with the greatest need. During this period, several of the district's schools have been closed, and the relative poverty ranking of some schools has changed, requiring some adjustments in the assignment of supportive service personnel.

Many of the minor or routine changes in the supportive services budget, items such as normal salary increases, are, in effect, adopted by being written into the proposal for the following year by the Title I Coordinator and the Director of Special Programs. The Assistant Superintendent for Instruction must approve the proposal before it is forwarded; any major changes in the Title I program are also reviewed by a "superintendency team" consisting of

three assistant superintendents. As an example of such a major change, the respondent mentioned the district's decision to request funds for temporary classrooms to enable them to enlarge the pre-kindergarten program in the district.

C. Needs Assessment and Program Evaluation

During the interview relatively little time was spent discussing needs assessment for the supportive services. Our respondent was not working in the Title I program when the health service was initiated prior to the 1973-74 school year, and most of those who would have been involved in planning for the service are no longer present in the district. Our respondent expressed the supposition that the person then acting as local budget consultant for nursing services and the records on the incidence of services provided in the different schools of the district by local budget nurses would have been consulted, but she did not have first hand knowledge of the planning. She did note, however, that the PAC could not have been consulted at that time, since it had not yet been formed.

Needs assessment for the other ancillary services has been based largely on the collective awareness of those in the district, particularly of teachers and principals in schools with large concentrations of economically disadvantaged students, that many of the domestic and social problems that affect a child's attendance and performance in school are particularly wide-spread among those in the Title I target population. The experience of district personnel in dealing with the problems of Title I children has provided the basic needs assessment. Impetus for hiring the attendance aides, for example, came in large part from the principals of the Title I schools, who, in the course of their regular duties, would regularly be confronted by the chronic attendance problems of the Title I children.

As noted previously, the goal of the supportive services programs is not simply to meet the health or nutritional needs of the Title I students, but to meet these needs in order to enable the students to profit from the various instructional programs. Given this instrumental character of the goals of the supportive services and the great number of other factors that affect a child's academic achievement, it is extremely difficult to measure the success of supportive services programs in terms of their contribution to the overall goals of Title I. There are significant problems, moreover, even in measuring the more immediate effectiveness of, for example, an ongoing program designed to encourage regular attendance at school. Thus, in response to a question about the impact of the district's attendance program, the respondent stated: "I don't know what it [attendance] would have been without it. It has made a difference, but there are many other factors that enter into it."

When asked a general question about the evaluation of the supportive services programs, the respondent indicated that "It's all been subjective. It's had to be subjective." She explained that those subjective evaluations are formed in part on the basis of the records maintained by the providers of the services, records which include figures on such items as the number of referrals, of home visits, treatments, screenings, etc. These records, which are forwarded to the Director of Special Programs and are used in the district's annual evaluation of its Title I program, provide some indication of the magnitude of the services provided, but do not measure the effectiveness of the services or the extent to which particular services are received by individual participants. Subjective evaluations are also based on the impressions and reactions to the programs reported by those involved in providing the services, by local budget teachers and administrators, by members of the PAC, or by

parents of Title I children. These impressions and reactions are almost uniformly positive. The respondent mentioned, for example, that during the 1973-74 school year, the regular classroom teachers had remarked on the noticeable improvement in the behavior of children who had attended sessions with the Title I guidance counselor. In similar ways, principals in schools offering the services, providers of the services, local budget teachers, and parents of Title I children have all indicated approval for the programs. In planning meetings, Title I school principals are "always . . . yelling for more nurses and more health/attendance aides." The district has been particularly pleased with the health/attendance aides: "They made a place for themselves and it worked and that's the reason we've kept them." The only negative reactions to the supportive services mentioned by the respondent were ones arising from the limited nature of the services, e.g., complaints from parents of non-Title I children who were not eligible for services or complaints from staff personnel in a Title I school which, because of program realignments based on the free lunch count, have lost services offered in previous years (When a school loses a service, " . . . oh, we hear it then from the principals, from the teachers, and from everyone concerned.")

A practical evaluation of the comparative merits of the different supportive services takes place each year as the district plans its supportive services program for the following year. Some aspects of planning are discussed above in the section on decision-making; here we note some of the evaluative implications of the district's past decisions and future plans for services. Implicit in the district's decisions to provide the health service in the Title I schools with the highest proportion of economically disadvantaged students is the view that the health service is in some way the

most critical or the most valuable of the services offered. The consideration being given to replacing the visiting teachers with additional health/attendance aides is further evidence of the district's satisfaction with the performance of the aides and suggests, perhaps, that the district sees greater usefulness in the aspects of the social work services that do not require the particular professional qualifications of the visiting teachers. In comparing the nurses and attendance aides to the visiting teachers and explaining the district's plan to hire more aides, the respondent commented that "it's becoming more difficult to justify the role of the visiting teacher . . . We just didn't feel we were getting the mileage for the money and the effort."

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

In general, the district considers its supportive services a valuable adjunct to its Title I instructional program. The goal of the supportive services is to contribute to the primary academic achievement goals of the instructional programs, and the district sees its supportive services as making a significant, if imprecisely measurable contribution to those goals. Though the local budget and other state and federal programs provide funds for some services analogous to those provided under Title I, Title I funds enable the district to concentrate additional services specifically on those children identified as having special needs and to provide those services with greater frequency or intensity than is possible with services that must be available to all children in the district. Without Title I funds, the district might be able to maintain some services with funds from elsewhere, but, in all likelihood, without the focus and concentration that is now possible.

In its planning for the future, the district is giving consideration to several changes that would affect the types of personnel providing services,

though not the types of services. As noted previously, one such change would be the replacement of visiting teachers with additional health/attendance aides. A similar change would be to replace the registered nurses with licensed practical nurses. Both changes would result in considerable savings in personnel costs with little, if any, change in services, and might enable the district to extend its supportive services to more Title I children. The respondent also mentioned, as one facet of existing services the district would like to expand in the future, its efforts to provide basic health and nutritional education for the parents of Title I children.

A number of factors work to limit the district's planning to increase its supportive services. The most prominent is that Title I funds are limited and that the highest priority in planning must be given to instructional programs. Other factors include the difficulty of finding qualified personnel and the decreasing enrollment in the district which presents a continuing possibility that newly created positions could not be retained and, if discontinued, might result in significant personnel problems.

Among the difficulties the district has encountered in administering the Title I programs, the respondent identified the following:

> 1) the general and continuing problem of ensuring that Title I funds are spent for supportive services that serve only children who are participating in Title I instructional programs. That requirement led to the abandonment of the Title I library/media center aides prior to the 1973-74 school year. It leads to complaints from parents of non-Title I children--to whom the administrators must explain the workings of the Title I program and the reasons for their children's exclusion from various services ("All the people in Title I have to be diplomats.") It also creates some frustration for school principals, who, during "flu season" or periods in which there is a high incidence of absence among regular classroom teachers, might wish to staff classes on a temporary basis with Title I personnel.
>
> 2) the requirement in previous years that Title I children, whose achievement scores improved sufficiently, be 'promoted' out of Title I eligibility. That led to some cyclicity in Title I enrollment: a Title I participant would improve, leave the program, fall behind once again in the regular classroom, and then return to

Title I the following year. The respondent mentioned that this problem should be remedied for the future, however, citing a change in regulations that will allow a child to remain in Title I classes so long as he is achieving below grade level and not, as previously, only so long as he is achieving below the level set for eligibility in Title I.

3) in previous years the district has received notification of its grant for the following year as late as May or June. That has greatly limited the time available for detailed planning of the specific programs. This problem, too, has apparently been eliminated, at least for the coming year, since the district has been told that it would receive notification of its grant by early March of this year.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
REPORT # 9

Outline

I. Introduction and highlights of report

II. Chronological narrative

A. 1973-74

B. 1974-75

C. 1975-76

D. 1976-77

III. Description of the district's services

A. Health

B. Community Services

C. Library/Resource Centers

D. Transportation

E. Speech Pathology

IV. Program planning and evaluation

A. Goals

B. Decision-making Process

C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

V. Summary: impressions, problems, plans

I. Introduction

The district serves a 44 square mile area, with a mostly rural population, though there are some urbanized portions of the district. Over the past four years the enrollment in the 13 public schools in the district has grown by about 500 students to a current enrollment of 8,900. There are no private schools in the district. In 1973-74 six schools qualified for Title I programs; 4 of these were elementary schools and 2 were junior high schools. Since 1974-75 only four schools, all elementary (K-5), have qualified for Title I. During these three years Title I schools have accounted for approximately 1/5 of the students enrolled in all district schools.

Approximately 11 percent of the district's students are black; 17 percent are Mexican-American; and the remaining students are white. This year the poverty level in the district was 20 percent of the students enrolled, according to AFDC data, which placed the district in the 86th percentile of poverty among the other districts in the state.

For the past four years the district has relied upon AFDC counts as the means for determining Title I eligibility for schools. Next year the district intends to use the data from the free school lunch program to determine eligibility. In 1975-76 the lowest percentage of poverty among the Title I eligible schools was 48 percent. Children in the Title I qualifying schools are selected for participation in the Title I instructional program on the basis of reading test scores; all students who score below grade level take part in the Title I program. However, the district requires as a bottom line for determining the number of Title I participants that an average of $350 in Title I funds be spent per participating student. So far it has not been necessary to target eligible students in order to fulfill this district-imposed criterion.

All students taking part in the Title I instructional program also take part in some aspect of the supportive service programs. In the past four years Title I supportive services have been offered in the areas of health, transportation, community services, library/resource center, and speech pathology. Except for the speech pathology program, which has only been in existence in a few of the Title I schools since 1975-76, the other programs have been in continuous operation in the district.

Prior to 1974-75, the district submitted a district-wide application for Title I funds. However, since 1974-75 the district has operated its Title I programs on an individual school-site-basis. Under this arrangement, each school which qualifies for Title I funds draws up and submits its own plan for the Title I program in that school. Thus, Title I programs vary from school to school, though the differences are slight since the state specifies certain elements that must be included in any Title I program. Since 1974-75 all federal and state funds for compensatory and special education programs are provided to each school under a consolidated grant; it is not necessary for schools to submit separate applications for Title I and other federal programs or for state-funded programs.

Because of the district's decentralization of the planning and administration of Title I programs and the consolidation of state and federal funds, specific information about Title I programs in the district was not easy to obtain nor was it completely accurate. Moreover, the respondents had been in their respective offices for only two years; information prior to 1975-76 was not readily accessible to them. Another factor affecting the quality of data gathered in this district is the lack of experience on the part of principals and school staff in record keeping. According to the respondents, it has taken most of the past three years for the district and the individual

schools to adjust to the shift from district to site planning; only this year are the principals and the district "sophisticated and experienced enough" to be able to do effective planning and record keeping.

II. Chronological Narrative

A. 1973-74

This was the last year of district-wide planning and application for Title I funds. Supportive services were offered in 3 of the district's 6 qualifying Title I schools in the areas of health and library/resource center and in 4 of the Title I schools in the areas of transportation and community services. All of the schools offering Title I services provided instruction in grades K-5; the two other Title I schools (both junior highs) offered only Title I funded instructional programs. The Title I supportive services accounted for 20 percent of the total Title I budget.

B. 1974-75

This year was the first year of the district's switch to individual school site-planning and application for Title I programs and the first year of consolidation of state and federal funds for compensatory and special education programs. Only 4 schools offering instruction in grades K-5 qualified for Title I programs. Supportive services were offered in the areas of health, transportation, and community services in all of the four schools; however, only three of the schools offered a program in the area of library/resource center. The Title I supportive services share of the total Tile I budget was 18 percent.

C. 1975-76

All four of the Title I qualifying schools offered programs in health, library/resource center, transportation, and community services, and one of the four schools offered a program in speech pathology. As last year, these schools

offered instruction in grades K-5, and the district continued to operate under the system of site-planning and application and consolidated funding. The supportive service program's share of the total Title I budget was 19 percent.

D. 1976-77

The only difference between last year's services and this year's is the addition of one school to the number of schools served by the speech pathology program. Two of the four Title I schools now offer such services. This year the supportive service programs in the four schools account for 21 percent of the total Title I budget for the district.

III. Description of the District's Services

A. Health

Health services funded by Title I have been in operation in the district during the four-year study period. In 1973-74 health services were available in 3 of the 6 qualifying Title I schools; since 1974-75 all four of the qualifying Title I schools have offered health services to Title I children. All schools with the health program serve grades K-5.

Each school has a certified Public Health nurse who divides her time between Title I and non-Title I duties. The amount of time allocated to Title I duties varies from school to school and from year to year depending upon several factors: the need for health services, the priority set by the school on health services, the number of Title I children in the school and the size of the school's Title I budget. Currently, one school has allocated 4/5 of the nurse's time to Title I; another has allocated only 1/5. In all the schools an additional day (1/5 time) of each nurse's time is paid by local budget funds for the provision of health services to all children in the school. Funds from other federal programs may also supplement the Title I health program in schools where these

other programs are in effect.

Title I health services include vision, hearing, and dental screening; nutrition and health education in the classroom; health education workshops with parents; and home visitation. During the past two years the health services have concentrated more on nutrition and health education and less on home visitation, much of which is now done by the community aides under the community service program. Local budget funds provide for necessary health supplies. Title I nurses also provide referral services to Title I children. An inventory of health services available in the community and plans for utilizing them is a routine part of each health program.

The health program may differ slightly from school to school as a result of the school-site planning in effect in the district. "One school may place more priority on screening and referral than on nutrition. But in many ways these differences simply depend on the nurse's emphasis rather than on the emphasis set by the program in each school. However, there are some differences in the programs themselves. One school, for instance, works on the basis of programmed learning, and places a lot of emphasis on parent education and health counselling. But another school might place less emphasis on these aspects of the program."

B. Community Services

Community services programs supported by Title I funds have been in continuous operation in the district throughout the study period in all the Title I schools offering instruction in grades K-5. Community services have been provided in the district by a staff made up of a PAC Co-Ordinator and several Home Visitation Aides. The PAC Co-Ordinator serves as a resource person for the PAC's in each Title I school, conducts workshops and training sessions for PAC members and also administrates the work of the Home Visitation Aides. Part of the PAC Co-Ordinator's duties include work with parents

in the district's non-Title I pre-k program: approximately half of her time is spent on Title I duties.

While the PAC Co-Ordinator holds a BA degree, the Home Visitation Aides are not professionally trained, and are selected for their work on the basis of familiarity with the communities in which they work. However, some background in social work is expected. The chief duties of the Home Visitation Aides are counselling the families of Title I children in areas such as attendance and health information, providing information about the Title I program to parents and encouraging parent participation in PAC acitivities. Over the four year period there has been a full time Home Visitation Aide at each Title I school offering community services. This year the school with the largest concentration of Title I children has 2 full time Home Visitation Aides. These aides have taken over an increasingly large share of the home visitation services for health matters which were formerly provided by the Title I nurses.

C. Library/Media Center

In 1973-74 and 1974-75 three of the four Title I elementary schools (K-5) had a library/media center as part of their Title I program; in 1975-76 and 1976-77 all 4 Title I elementary schools have a library/media center funded by Title I. Each school has a part-time uncertified media technician who is responsible for cataloging and dispensing Title I media supplies, such as study prints, cassettes, and multi-cultural materials, to the Title I teachers. These technicians also operate the audio-visual equipment as part of their Title I duties, and make resource materials available to Title I teachers.

The respondents were most unclear about the operation and budgets for the library/media centers. They explained that most of the Title I schools have "put their Title I media centers together gradually over a period of

time, but some schools, such as _____, have set up completely equipped centers in one year. In 1974-75, for instance, _____ spent $32,000 to equip its Title I library and media center."

D. Transportation

Transportation services for "field trips and cultural enrichment activities" have been provided in all eligible Title I schools during the four-year study period.

E. Speech Pathology

A limited speech pathology program has been funded through Title I since 1975-76, when it was begun in one school. In 1976-77 a second school selected speech pathology as a component of its Title I program. The speech pathology program supported by Title I funds is supplementary in these schools to similar services provided by local budget funds. The Title I speech pathology program came into being when

> . . . one principal felt that it was a good idea because his staff wer lacking in technical expertise in this area. So, he applied for funds to support a speech pathology program under which a speech pathologist, in addition to working with students in the classroom, also provides in-service training for Title I teachers. Of course, the state geve an added impetus to setting up this program since they required the separation of language development from the reading program. One school last year and two schools this year developed the speech pathology program to fill the requirement of a language development component in their Title I programs.

IV. Program Planning and Evaluation

A. Goals

The respondents were unable to give a general characterization of the goals of the Title I supportive service programs in the districts, explaining that each individual school sets its own goals, measured in terms of needs to be met, which vary from school to school.

B. Decision-Making Process

Since the implementation of individual school site planning in the district beginning in the 1974-75 school year, Title I applications, which are combined in one application with other federal and state compensatory and special education programs, are prepared at each individual school qualifying for Title I funds. In roughly chronological order, the planning process works in this way. The district, according to AFDC counts, determines those schools which are eligible for Title I programs for the coming year, and then, on the basis of reading scores, estimates the number of potential participants in the Title I programs in each school. This number is multiplied by $350, the average Title I expenditure per pupil in the district, in order to determine the tentative allocation of Title I funds for each qualifying school. (This minimum of $350 was set by the Board, in order to assure that each school received its fair share of Title I funds and to guarantee that Title I funds would not be spread too thinly. The district was recently consolidated and the Board makes every effort "to spread the money as evenly as possible throughout the district in order to keep each school happy.")

Once projected allocations have been determined, the district provides whrkshops in Title I planning for the principals of each school to explain the current guidelines and regulations and to assist them with the planning

process. Then the principals, in consultation with the school's Title I advisory committee, which is composed of Title I staff and parents (who make up at least 51 percent of the committee), plan the Title I program for that school.

The respondents were not totally satisfied with this process.

> The individual schools do decide what funds to use for what services and what priorities to place upon these services, but in all schools instruction must take first priority, and, of course, programs already in effect usually stay in effect, especially if the staff for that program have been successful and can argue well. And the state's guidelines are so heavy-handed and proscriptive that there really isn't much choice to be made anyway. Each school, for instance, must have certain elements in its program, though they don't all have to be funded through Title I. There must be programs in reading, math, language development, parent involvement, health, multi-cultural, staff development, and other auxiliary services, to name a few of their requirements. Basically at the individual school level the principal has the deciding voice.
>
> And you must remember that local-site planning has not been in effect very long here, but as the schools gain experience with it, they become gradually more sophisticated in their programs and their setting of priorities. This year, for instance, things are going much better. But at first, the principals simply lacked the expertise to do this kind of planning, though we of course at the district office helped them as much as we could.

Once each school has set its priorities "for which it has the final authority, though within the range of the guidelines set by the state," it then submits its application to the district Title I office for review, which then sends all applications on to the Board and from there to the state.

> The Board of Education can refuse to accept an individual school's plan, and the same goes for us at our office. I won't take a plan that I think is illegal or doesn't meet the state guidelines; I simply will not submit it to the Board for their approval. [It was not clear that this has ever occurred.] But still, there is a lot of leeway for the individual school. They do set their own priorties, choose their program emphases, and make decisions like whether to use certified or uncertified staff. The school may say they would like to have counselling, for instance, but when it comes down to setting the priorities, it's always reading and math, and reading always comes out number one."

C. Needs Assessment and Program Evaluation

As with the program planning process, each individual school draws up its own needs assessment and evaluation of its Title I programs. The district

office prepares a form for each school to use in drawing up its needs assessment.

> For instance, for the needs assessment for the health program, there are items like numbers of frequent absences, incidence of allergies, hearing and visual problems, the number of children with orthopedic problems, and so on, all prepared on the basis of screening programs. There is also a space to include the number of children screened, the numbers of children found to have various medical problems and so on. And, we have a space for the availability of medical care in the community and how the nurse plans to use these available services.

This needs assessment plays an important role as each school sets its priorities for the coming year.

The evaluation of the Title I programs, especially the supportive services, is conducted solely by the principal on the basis of whether or not the service was "fully implemented, attempted but not implemented, partially implemented, or not attempted." In determining the degree to which a program is implemented, the principal refers to the goals set for the program by the advisory committee. In essence, then "there is no formal evaluation procedure. It rests strictly on the principal's assessment, and each principal decides how he will conduct his own evaluation. The principal's assessment is basically subjective, though we suppose they rely upon statistics. And they must keep records, because they could always be audited."

There is, at the district level, an on-going type of program evaluation. "Each month there is a district-level committee on Title I which reviews the progress of Title I programs at each school. At these meetings each school reports on what they are supposed to be doing and how they are meeting their goals."

V. Summary: Impressions, problems, plans

It was clear from the interview that the shift to individual school-site planning in the district has had mixed results. On the one hand, decentralization of the planning and administration of Title I programs has resulted in more committment to the programs at the local school level. And yet, there are many drawbacks.

> Even though the principals and staff are more committed to these programs because they plan them themselves, they really don't have the expertise to do efficient planning. What we end up with in each school is what the local people think is wonderful; they don't make use of current research and scholarship in the area. It would certainly be more efficient and faster if the district did the planning, as we do with our ESAA projects.
>
> Basically a centrally administered program will make the most efficient and effective use of the available funds. But then there are problems of commitment and cooperation from the local staff who view the program as "yours" instead of "theirs." Decentralized programs, like Title I, avoid this kind of central administration-local staff friction, and make real commitment to the program at the local level. But it's difficult to evaluate such decentralized programs, especially in a consistent way, and thus it's difficult to have an overall sense of how the program is working, especially at the district level.

There was some question in the respondents' minds about how much actual local planning took place at the district schools.

> In a sense the state guidelines inhibit actual site-planning. The state requires so many basic elements in these programs that we at the district level can afford to take a hands-off stance. It is a decentralized program, but really it's very proscriptive, as far as I'm concerned. The state says it's the local school's decision, but all you really have is some control over how the program works. And even then you can be put out of compliance. I don't feel that there's been the kind of local control they say there has been. It's kind of a farce, in a sense. For instance, transportation is the only Title I program in our district that's not mandated by the state. Where's the creativity that's supposed to come from local control? Our biggest problem is that the state has too many requirements. We don't have any flexibility. Every year we get a new prescription. Inter- and intrapersonal components are now required [in the program], and it's just nonsense as far as I'm concerned.

In addition to a generally negative assessment of the state's guidelines for the site-planning process, my respondents were critical of other actions on the part of the state.

> Sometimes the state requires us to write objectives that are simply Utopian. These requirements demoralize the staff and make them cynical, so that they think the objective-writing process is simply a rote kind of thing, because it's not done realistically. They think it's just another job to do in order to placate some consultant or official.
>
> If the goal of the Title I program is to assist students to be successful in school, then the emphasis should be upon this end result, you know what I mean? We should focus on how successful

> the children are at the end of three years, or whatever, and cut out all this proscriptive nonsense. Give us a chance to account for our own programs; the federal government should not be so proscriptive. I'm not saying that we shouldn't be held accountable; we should be, but I think there's another way of running the show.

There have been two specific problems in the district that my respondents mentioned. One had to do with comparability, a problem created by the presence of other programs, such as ECE, in Title I schools. "We've had to count ECE funds as part of the local budget funds, and that makes a real problem if another school doesn't have ECE funds. As a result we've had to use local budget funds to make up such differences." And there has been some difficulty in making certain that only Title I staff and students use the materials and equipment purchased for the Title I library programs. "We've certainly had some technical violations, but it's not such a problem now since several of the Title I schools are made up of almost 80-90 percent Title I children."

In giving a general assessment of the Title I supportive programs in the district, the respondents were of two minds. One felt that such programs were outside the proper purview of the schools.

> I would not be upset if they were to cut out all the supportive services, because I feel that we can in the school setting do just so much to meet these kinds of social problems, at least in the way our programs are presently constituted. I would just cut them all out. I think the responsibility of the schools is to educate--to provide children the ability to read and compute--and it's the parents' responsibility to take care of these other things. And even if it were our responsibility, I don't feel that we are able to address those areas in the child's home environment that are affecting low achievement in the schools. From the state's point of view it appears to be philosophically not the thing to do. I think if there were a lot of support services, more than there are now, then Title I would not be so popular; it's popular now because of the focus on instruction.

The other respondent was not quite so critical.

> I don't like the way that support services are administered presently. However, I do feel that there is a need for such services, especially for psychological services. There are now none

> in the district. We need psychological counseling services, and Title I may be the only way to provide them. Most of our kids are from broken homes, and it's affected the crime rate and everything else. But we'll never get such a program going because we already have our programs set up, and people seem to do the same that they've done before. We'd have to drop some existing program. Psychological services simply have not ranked high enough in the priorities.

The other respondent agreed with the need for psychological services and the unlikelihood of getting them funded.

Yet the respondents found some positive aspects to the Title I supportive service program.

> In health, the strongest point I see is the early diagnosis of disorders in children, such as visual and orthopaedic problems, that might otherwise have gone unnoticed and untreated. Title I has allowed the schools to intensify their health programs, and I know for a fact that if Title I were to be withdrawn tomorrow there would not be a way to replace those services. Prior to Title I funded health services the nurses in the district were spread so thin that people thought they didn't do anything, but now they can present programs and perform services and people see the effect of them. The community service program has also been good in that it really has gotten the parents involved.

Nevertheless, one respondent returned to an earlier point.

> I suppose I shouldn't say this, but I see the supportive services as the weakest part of the Title I program. They're the least well supervised, and are the least well evaluated. They're not an exemplary part of the program. It's the subjective and sloppy evaluation of them that disturbs me. There should be more validation, more statistics available. I think the principal should require such record keeping, but it's not being done because they aren't required.
>
> And if we were to require them, well, there would be just one more prescription to be filled. It would help, however, if we had someone from the outside, an outside evaluator, to help them [the local schools] play the numbers game.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 10

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

- A. 1973-74, 1974-75
- B. 1975-76
- C. 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

- A. Social Work
- B. Health
- C. Parent Involvement
- D. Transportation
- E. Food

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Goals
- B. Decision-making Process
- C. Evaluation and Needs Assessment

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS, AND FUTURE PLANS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

The district serves a county-wide population of 160,000, many of whom are associated with one of the two military bases within the district's attendance area. Currently there are 36,000 students enrolled in the district's schools, compared with 33,500 students enrolled in 1973-74. This year approximately 69 percent of the students are white, 27 percent black, 2 percent American Indian, and the remaining 2 percent are Oriental and students with Spanish surnames. This racial mix has remained approximately the same during the four-year study period.

This year the district relied upon a school survey to determine the poverty level in each school, based on factors such as the number of families receiving AFDC or general assistance and the number of unemployed or disabled parents. This information was then used to select Title I eligible schools. Those schools which have more than the district's average percentage of students from low-income families, which was 18 percent, qualified for Title I. In the preceding years the district has used a combination of the free school lunch count and a school survey to determine Title I eligibility. In 1975-76 the qualifying percentage was 18.8 percent.

Currently there are 54 public schools in the district, which represents an increase of 4 schools since 1973-74. Thirty-one of these public schools qualify for Title I instructional and supportive service programs; in 1973-74 26 schools qualified. The two private schools in the district, which serve approximately 125 students, have not taken part in the Title I program.

The student enrollment in the Title I schools has increased from 13,000 in 1973-74 to 17,000 in 1976-77. During this same period, however, the numbers of children taking part in Title I programs has decreased

slightly from a high of 3,200 in 1974-75 to the current 2,800. During the four-year study period the total Title I budget has decreased slightly from $1,480,000 in 1973-74 to a current level of $1,365,000. The supportive service programs' share of this budget has varied between 8 and 9 percent during the past four years; this year it accounts for 8 percent of the total budget.

Children are selected for participation in the Title I instructional program on the basis of academic deficiencies measured by test scores, primarily the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. "Teacher judgment comes into this process only when two or more children have the same deficiency level and we must choose only one of them because of limited space. Then subjective evaluations are considered." On the basis of teacher referrals or screening programs, all children in the Title I instructional program are eligible to receive Title I supportive services.

Supportive service programs in health, social work, transportation, and parent involvement have been provided in the district for all four years. In 1973-74 and 1974-75 there was also a small food program supported by Title I funds for a summer Title I session. The programs in health and social work are provided as concentrated supplements to similar programs supported by local budget funds. The Title I transportation service supports field trips for students in the Title I reading and math program and provides regular student transportation for kindergarteners (until this year) and pre-kindergarteners (ongoing). Until the state assumed the funding for the kindergarten program this year, both the kindergarten and pre-kindergarten were supported entirely by Title I.

Since prior to 1973-74, supportive service programs in health, social work, and transportation have been in operation and have undergone little change. The year 1973-74 marked the start of the parent involvement

program, which, like the other programs, has remained basically unchanged during the four-year study period.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74, 1974-75

Title I supportive services were provided in 26 of the district's 50 public schools in 1973-74, and 29 of the 49 public schools in 1974-75 in the areas of health, social work, food, transportation, and parent involvement. Programs in health and social work were provided during the regular school year as concentrated, supplementary services to similar services provided by local funds. Health services included dental and medical screening and referral, as well as the provision of psychological services and health corrections to Title I children. Social work services, provided by "liaison teachers," included evaluations and referrals to special programs within the school or to social agencies outside the school, home visitation, and consultation with Title I staff and parents. Clothing was also provided to Title I children under this program. This was the first year that funds were made available for the parent involvement program, which organized local PAC's; provided refreshments, travel reimbursement, and babysitting services to parents attending PAC meetings; and kept parents informed about Title I activities through workshops and mailed announcements. The transportation services provided field trips for students in Title I reading and math programs, as well as supported regular student transportation for students in the pre- and kindergarten programs. Food services were provided for a limited Title I summer program, which was funded entirely by Title I.

B. 1975-76

Services in health, social work, transportation, and parent involvement were provided in 31 of the district's 53 public schools. However, since there was no summer program funded by Title I, no food services were provided from Title I funds.

C. 1976-77

As in the preceding years, services were provided in health, social work, transportation, and parent involvement. Since the state assumed funding responsibility in this year for the kindergarten program, regular student transportation was provided only for the pre-kindergarten program, which is funded entirely by Title I.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

A. Social work

The social work program has been in continuous operation during the four-year study period in all qualifying Title I schools. Staffed by five full-time social workers who hold BA's in social work or have some field experience, the program defines itself as an "advocate for Title I students in the school system." Children who need assistance either from one of the on-going special programs in the school, such as the learning disability program, or from a social work agency outside the school are referred to the social workers by the principal of the individual school, who receives referrals from classroom teachers. In some cases, the social workers may also handle referrals for medical treatment recommended by the school nurses. For referrals to programs within the school system, the social worker is responsible for scheduling evaluation sessions with the school psychologist or special services staff and following up these evaluations

to see that they are successfully implemented. For referrals to agencies outside the school system, the social worker may make home visitations to explain the child's needs to his or her parents and to assist the family in finding the appropriate agency where services can be obtained. In the case of clothing needs, the social worker can draw upon Title I clothing funds as a last resort if no other sources for clothing are available. Social workers also spend some of their visitation time with parents explaining Title I programs and services.

The social work staff is assigned to Title I schools under a system which enables an individual social worker to concentrate on five schools and to be on call to two or three others. In the course of a typical week, a social worker may visit four schools for one day each, and alternate the fifth day among two schools which have less concentration of Title I students than those schools which receive a full day's coverage. The work of the social workers is concentrated on grades pre-kindergarten - six as part of the district's focus on early intervention; they are only on call at the Title I schools which offer instruction in grades seven and up.

There is also a social work program supported by local budget funds. This year there are 16 social workers supported by local funds who are assigned to 54 schools in the district, much in the same way Title I social workers are assigned. Local budget staff average one to one-and-a-half days in each school. The extra day provided in Title I schools by the Title I staff is thus supplementary to those social work services provided by local funds. In order to assure that both Title I and local budget social workers do not work with the same families, the district has instituted an

arrangement whereby a family with a single child in the school district who also qualifies for Title I services is put on the Title I case load; if there is more than one child from the same family in the school system, then the local budget worker will provide services to that family, regardless of the child's Title I status. However, the Title I social worker may provide in-school referral services to Title I qualifying children in such families.

Over the years of the social work program, which has been in existence in the district since 1966, local budget funds have gradually assumed some of the burden of the program, which originally was funded entirely by Title I. Thus, the success of the Title I program prior to the study period has been an incentive to the district to fund its own social work program. However, this support from local funds has not been sufficient to replace the Title I program entirely. "Our social work program taken as a whole is still not sufficient. Our Title I social workers, for instance, average a case load of 300 students; and it simply isn't possible to provide really intensive services to that many students. A child in the Title I program may need services, and we may be able to obtain them for him; but in many cases we aren't able to give that case the kind of thorough follow-up we would like."

B. Health

Like the social work program, the Title I health program has been in continuous operation during the four-year study period in all qualifying Title I schools. The health program is staffed by three full-time registered nurses who provide medical screening and referral services to Title I children. Children are seen by the Title I nurse as a result of referrals from classroom teachers or as a part of the re-screening program routinely provided by Title I nurses to Title I children. The district plans to

rely more on such routine examinations of all Title I children for identification of health needs. "We really wonder about the ability of the classroom teacher to identify health needs. Not all such needs are apparent to an observer untrained in health matters." This year, for instance, "complete physicals" were performed by the Title I nurses on all Title I children in the pre-kindergarten program and on all Title I children in grades 7-9. In addition audio-metric testing was provided to all children enrolled in the Title I reading and math program; next year there are plans to provide routine screening for vision needs on all students in the Title I reading and math program. Three Titmus machines have been purchased for this purpose.

In addition to the screening for hearing, vision, dental, behavioral, and other medical needs of Title I children, the Title I nurse, on the basis of these examinations, refer children to medical providers in the area and assist parents in obtaining needed services for their children. "The parents may know that a problem is there, but they don't know what to do about it. For instance, a family may be eligible for AFDC medical benefits, but may not know how to use these benefits. Our Title I staff help them with this. One problem we have with this aspect of the program is the travel involved. Our district is really spread out." If no other funds are available, either in the school or from an outside agency, Title I funds may be used to pay for health corrections. Referrals made by the Title I nurse for psychological examination are also covered under the Title I health budget.

Health services are also provided by 32 Public Health nurses, who are supported by local funds and serve <u>both</u> city and county schools. Each Public Health nurse is assigned to approximately four schools. Each Title I nurse is assigned to 10 of the qualifying 31 Title I schools in the

district, and provides additional services (such as rescreening) to those offered by the Public Health nurses. "We try to get into each school twice a month, but that really isn't often enough. These children whom we identify as needing health services require careful follow-up; we don't have the staff to do that adequately. In many cases we must rely on the classroom teacher for follow-up, and they are not always able to recognize continuing health problems."

C. Parent involvement

The parent involvement program, which was first funded as part of the Title I program in 1973-74, has been in continuous operation since. Staffed by a full-time Parent Advisory Council Co-Ordinator, the parent involvement program is administered by the office of the Assistant Superintendent for Federal and State Programs. The first task of this program was to organize PAC's in all of the Title I schools, which was accomplished by the beginning of 1974-75. Since then, the focus of the program has been upon increasing parent participation in PAC activities. The work of the PAC Co-Ordinator is important in this regard. She serves as a resource person to PAC members, conducting training sessions in the use of office equipment and organizing and training parent volunteers as part of a program to assist the Title I instructional and support staff. Parents volunteer to help in the health program and in various aspects of the reading and math program, where they serve as tutors under the guidance of the professional staff. The parent involvement program also provides services to facilitate parent participation in PAC meetings, offering services such as babysitting, refreshments, and travel reimbursement to parents taking part in local PAC meetings, and travel and per diem reimbursement for PAC members who attend regional and state conferences.

Twice a year workshops are offered in federal and state Title I guidelines for PAC members. One is held at the end of the school year for newly selected PAC members; another the following fall as a refresher course.

The PAC Co-Ordinator functions as an advocate for PAC interests, and is sometimes in an antagonistic situation with the district staff as a result of this role. These antagonisms, particularly between the PAC and principal of some Title I schools, have decreased over time as the principals and other district staff have become accustomed to the presence of PAC's in the schools. The present Co-Ordinator had formerly been an assistant principal, and is thus able to relate in a positive way to the principals of the Title I schools.

The parent involvement program was intitated as a result of the federal guideline mandating parent participation in Title I planning. An added inducement to the original decision to fund this program was also provided by the recommendations of Title I parents. Though parents were "initially shy and reluctant to take part, they are now very active. Over 800 parents on the average attend the monthly PAC meetings in the district. This is twice as many who took part in PAC activities last year. On the whole we are proud of our program. It has been the most successful program of its kind in the state, and though there have been conflicts and disagreements [particularly between the PAC's and the school principals over decision-making authority], we think this program actually helps to decrease such antagonisms."

D. Transportation

Funds have been included under the Title I budget during the four-year study period for field trips for students in the Title I reading and

math programs and for student transportation and insurance to and from school for participants in the kindergarten and pre-kindergarten program. Since the state assumed the cost of the kindergarten program in the district beginning with the current year, student transportation is now provided only to the participants in the pre-kindergarten program. Since this program is supported entirely by Title I funds, as the kindergarten program was in the past, state funds are not available for student transportation and Title I money must be used for this purpose.

E. Food

Food services were provided in 1973-74 and 1974-75 to students participating in a Title I funded summer program. Since there were no locally funded summer programs in operation during these years, Title I funds were used to provide food services. Beginning with the summer of 1975-76, the school district has offered a summer program, thus making local funds available for food services and making the use of Title I funds for food services unnecessary.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The goals of the district's Title I supportive service programs in health and social work are to provide concentrated, supplementary services to Title I students in addition to those services provided from local funds. The social work program sees its role as serving as "advocates for Title I students" by assisting them in finding ways of meeting their social and environmental needs. The health program concentrates its efforts upon the identification of health problems that interfere with a child's performance in school: "Without the work of our Title I nurses, children would not be able to stay in school. For instance, this year our hearing

screening has identified 60 children with sever ear infections, which, if they had not been identified and treated, could have resulted in permanent hearing impairment." The goal of the parent involvement program is to meet the federal mandate of organizing and facilitating the work of PAC's at each Title I school and keeping Title I parents informed about Title I programs. The transportation and food programs funded under Title I exist in order to provide such services to Title I students when locally funded services are not available.

B. Decision-making process

Decisions regarding the Title I program in the district are made in the office of the Assistant Superintendent for Federal and State Programs, based on the recommendations of district staff, Title I staff, PAC's, and various community groups. "These recommendations are considered, and, on the basis of the evaluation and needs assessment, the office of the Assistant Superintendent then plans the Title I program for the coming year. The Board of Education has delegated to that office the decision-making authority, though any decisions that are made are reported to the Board for review. The Superintendent, of course, plays a role in this process. He reviews the planned program and provides his recommendations as well."

The various groups which contribute their recommendations to the Assistant Superintendent's office are kept up-to-date on all plans for the program by means of regular, on-going meetings with the principals, Title I staff, and PAC's. Among those social service agencies who are also consulted are the county offices for community action, mental health, county health, and social services. Though these groups technically have no decision-making power, their recommendations are given "thorough consideration." The final plans for the coming year are given to the county-wide PAC for their review; however, they are only able to make recommendations.

Over the past four years this planning process has resulted in few changes in the Title I supportive service program. "Our needs don't change that much, they just get greater, and we try to meet the needs of as many students as possible without watering down our services. Each year, on the basis of the available funds we attempt to increase our potential Title I population--that is the number of schools as well as students eligible for Title I services. This coming year, for instance, we've used another system for determining eligibility [free school lunch count] because we think it gives a better picture of poverty in the district. As a result of this, we can now add another Title I school; but we will cut back our program or the numbers served, if necessary. Our guiding light is not to water the program down. Now, this coming year my allocation is less than my projected budget, including salaries and raises for Title I personnel. It's clear that the first place I will have to cut for next year is those raises."

In making decisions to cut back, when necessary, the district has established a system of priorities, under which instructional programs in reading, pre-kindergarten, and math rate at the first priority, in that order; and supportive services in social work, health, and parent involvement rate at the second priority, in that order. The relative importance of the pre-kindergarten program is a reflection of the district's focus on early intervention. In spite of this system of priorities, my respondent explained that if he had to cut back in supportive services, "I would cut first in social work because it could be cut without destroying it, then health, then supportive services [health and social work] in the pre-kindergarten program, in that order. If I had a budget increase, I would give it to the reading program."

The PAC has other feelings. They have recommended increases in the numbers of social workers and health personnel serving the Title I

schools, but these have not been implemented. My respondent, however, felt that the PAC's "do share the district's priorities, but there is a difference, of course, because the parents don't feel qualified to make recommendations regarding the instructional program. And I agree with them. For most of them the supportive services--the social workers and nurses--are the most visible and understandable aspects of the Title I program. It's the part of the program in which they are most likely to be involved and feel most qualified to make recommendations about"

C. Program evaluation and needs assessment

The evaluation of the supportive service programs in health and social work involves review of the progress reports on the children in the programs, the subjective comments of teachers, the numbers of children referred to the programs, and psychological evaluations of children served. However, "the touchstone is the increase in the academic performance" of children who have taken part in both the instructional and supportive service Title I programs. Statistics regarding the numbers of parents who have taken part in PAC activities are the means for evaluating the success of the parent involvement program.

The evaluation of these programs is important in setting the needs for each program. Needs assessments for health and social work programs are couched in terms of the percentage of Title I students, based on the number of referrals, in need of that particular service. "Approximately 70 to 75 percent of the students in the Title I program have health needs this year, based on the number of referrals we received last year. A similar percentage is in need of social work services also."

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS, AND FUTURE PLANS

For the most part, the district has experienced little change in its Title I supportive service programs. Except for slight budget adjustments, these programs have remained the same over the past four years, serving approximately the same student population with a stable staff size. Most of the changes in the social work program occurred before 1973-74 as the program shifted its focus from dealing with subsistence issues, as a result of improvement in the economic status of the district, to a greater involvement with in-school referrals as new, more specialized programs came into existence. The health program is gradually moving from a reliance upon the referrals of classroom teachers, who, because of their lack of training in health, are not able to recognize all health needs of their children, to a routine rescreening of all eligible children for health needs. Programs in transportation and food have changed according to the availability of state funds for the programs Title I transportation and food services have supported, and the parent involvement program has increasingly become more successful in involving parents in PAC activities.

There have also been few problems in the district relating to Title I supportive services, although it is clear from the recommendations of the PAC and the needs expressed by the directors of the health and social work programs that additional funding is needed for these programs. The presence of military bases in the area produce a relatively transient population in the district, but this has created no difficulties for the Title I programs. However, the presence of many foreign nationals has caused problems for the district's bilingual program.

In spite of the state's setting a low priority on supportive programs, the district's programs have maintained a fairly constant level of funding: "When we ask for funds for supportive service programs from the state, we do our homework. We impress them by our application and our statistics that we know what we are doing. The state isn't opposed to innovative programs, such as our pre-kindergarten program, or to support services; but they prefer us to concentrate on reading and math. I think supportive service programs are worth defending, and I have done so and will continue to do so. I have defended our programs on the basis of their success and their design.

"I would like to see few changes in the future of Title I. And the changes I want are by no means radical. For one thing, I would like increased focus on early intervention; we think this is very important in our district. I would like to keep the flexibility we now have at the local level to come up and work with innovative programs, such as our pre-kindergarten program, and use our Title I funds as best suits us. I'm in favor of programs like Title I as long as this local flexibility remains."

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 11

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

- A. Pre 1973-74
- B. 1973-74
- C. 1974-75
- D. 1975-76
- E. 1976-77

III. SERVICES OFFERED IN THE DISTRICT

- A. Health Service
- B. Psychological Services
- C. Transportation
- D. Social Work
- E. School-Community Workers

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Goals
- B. Needs Assessment and Program Evaluation
- C. Program Planning and Decision Making

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

This district is located in a city with several large industries and a population of 110,000. It maintains 30 public schools (23 are elementary schools) which serve slightly over 17,000 students, a figure that represents a decline of about 2,000 over the last four years. Thirteen nonpublic schools in the district serve an additional 1,600 students from the district attendance area. About 30 percent of the students in the public schools come from low-income families; in the district's Title I schools the percentage ranges from 35 to 70 percent. Blacks, the only sizeable minority group in the district, make up about 25 percent of the district's student population.

The district currently offers Title I programs in 13 public and 5 nonpublic elementary schools. Four of the district's junior high and high schools are eligible for but do not participate in Title I; they are served by state compensatory education programs. The schools eligible for Title I are determined on the basis of free and reduced lunch counts; the schools where the percentage of free or reduced lunches exceed the district average are eligible. Currently, all of the eligible elementary schools do offer Title I programs; but not all of the students in those schools who are eligible to participate in the programs by virtue of their scores on standardized tests are able to participate in the instructional programs. The respondent estimated that the district is able to serve only about half of the eligible students. State guidelines require that regular Title I instructional sessions allow about 10 minutes per child; this enables each of the Title I teachers to serve 30 to 40 students. The number of teachers whose salaries can be accomodated by the district's Title I allocation thus limits the number of children who can participate in the program.

At different times during the four year period studied, the district has offered a total of four Title I supportive services: health, psychological, social work and transportation. Before 1971, the district's Title I program employed a total of six to eight nurses, a psychologist, and a staff of some 17 home-school liaison personnel (certified teachers who performed many social work duties). For a number of reasons (see the chronological narrative below), these staff positions were cut or eliminated altogether in 1971. From 1971-74, Title I provided the services of two nurses and four social workers. In addition to Title I services, state compensatory education funds paid for seventeen nonprofessional home-community workers who replaced the home-school liaison staff and provided many of the same services. During these years, the district planned, and in 1974-75 began implementing the centralized provision of services through a diagnostic center. Since then the district's Title I supportive services have been offered through the diagnostic center, where a team consisting of a psychologist, 2 nurses and a prescriptive teacher in reading and in math provided extensive diagnostic testing for Title I children. (Two social workers were also part of the diagnostic team during its frst year of operation, but they were phased out after 1974-75.)

The present concentration of services in the diagnostic center presents a marked change from the manner in which supportive services were delivered in the district in earlier years. This restructuring of the district's supportive seervices program has been influenced by at least two major considerations: the district's desire to place greater emphasis on the instructional components of its Title I programs and its desire to include in Title I only those services or programs that can make a measurable contribution to the educational goals of Title I.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. Pre 1973-74

Before 1971 the district offered several well-staffed supportive services. These included a health program staffed by six to eight nurses; a psychologist who provided testing and referrals in the various Title I schools; and--the largest single component--17 home-school liaisons. One of these was assigned to each of the seventeen schools eligible for Title I. The liaisons, who were professionally certified teachers, provided a variety of services, including follow-up on attendance problems, parent-involvement activities, and some services normally performed by social workers, such as arranging referrals to social service agencies in the community. Their work was particularly valued by the school principals; they were like "the principal's right arm" in dealing with problems involving home-school relations.

All of these programs underwent a reevaluation when a new Title I director came to the program; several major changes resulted. The new director found the nursing staff excessive and decided to cut it back to two nurses. This change entailed no great loss of services, however, since some of the nurses were transferred to local budget positions. The cost of maintaining the liaison staff was found to be prohibitive; the district was spending more for its liaison staff than for its Title I prescriptive reading teachers; and the new director decided that this program should be eliminated. The service provided by the psychologist was found to be inadequately organized and somewhat ineffective with much of the psychologist's time being used in traveling to and from the different Title I schools; so the decision was made to eliminate this position.

The thrust of these changes was to place primary emphasis in the district's Title I program on instruction in academic subjects. The respondent explained that when Title I programs first began, a considerable amount of new money was available and the district was not fully prepared with comprehensive plans for allocating this new money. It began a number of new programs, including the large supportive services, some of which proved to be very useful. The overall result, however, was that the district's Title I program did not place sufficient emphasis on instructional services. In making these cuts and the further changes that followed in later years, the district's aim was to make its Title I supportive services directly supportive of its Title I instructional program. The respondent mentioned too, that the state was not particularly happy with the district's commitment to supportive services; he indicated that had the district not made the change when it did the state might have required it within another year or two. Speaking particularly of the liaison workers, he said, "[I]t was a matter of a short time. . . [T]he state wouldn't even approve it anymore; today you could never get that through; you couldn't even get a social worker through, I don't think. I would doubt very much they'd approve anything like that."

As part of the plan to eliminate the liaisons, the district proposed to hire a group of nonprofessional school-community workers to perform essentially the same services that had been provided by the liaisons. As had been the case with the liaisons, one school-community worker was to be stationed at each of the district's Title I eligible schools. Funds for these home-community workers were to be provided through a state compensatory education program. To compensate for the loss of the expertise of the liaisons, the district further proposed to hire, with Title I money, four social workers. The social workers were to handle the more difficult

cases requiring the services of skilled professionals and to train the community workers. The plan was that the social workers would serve only during a transition period of several years and would be phased out of the program as the community workers became capable of providing the services by themselves.

The proposed change met with strong opposition from the liaison workers themselves and from the school principals, who were particularly concerned that the uncertified, and at that time untrained, school-community workers would be unable to provide adequate services. They were not persuaded by the director's argument that the community-workers, with the interim assistance of the social workers, would quickly acquire the necessary skills and that there would be no significant loss in services. They appealed their case to the state Title I office, but the state refused to intervene and the director's plan was implemented. Thus, prior to the 1973-74 school year the district's Title I supportive services were cut to two nurses and four social workers, supplemented by the seventeen school-community workers funded under the state compensatory education program.

B. 1973-74

During this year the district continued to offer its health and social work programs through the two nurses and four social workers. The services were offered in all of the participating Title I schools--thirteen public and five non-public schools. The district also maintained the seventeen school-community workers, one of whom was stationed in each of the thirteen elementary schools participating in Title I and one of whom was stationed in each of the four secondary public schools in the district that were eligible for, but not participating in, Title I activities, though they were participating in state compensatory education programs.

C. 1974-75

Although the district decided to drop the psychologist from its Title I program when it reorganized its supportive services during the 1971 school year, the prescriptive teachers in the Title I program and the principals of Title I schools believed that there was a continuing need for psychological services and requested that something be done to replace the lost services. As a consequence the Title I director had begun formulating plans for a Title I diagnostic center built around the services of a psychologist and structured so that there would be a continuous flow of children through the center throughout the school year. Finally, this year, after a gap of two years in which there had been no psychologist funded through Title I, the district opened a diagnostic center staffed by a Title I psychologist, a prescriptive teacher for reading, a prescriptive teacher for math, the two Title I nurses, and Title I social workers. (This year the district also cut back the number of social workers in the program from four to two, a change representing another step in the transition from professional to nonprofessional school-community services.)

When referred to the diagnostic center, a child would receive psychological testing, diagnostic testing to determine the problem areas in his academic achievement, and a physical examination. Results of the testing would be discussed with the child's parents and, where necessary, referrals for specialized treatment would be arranged, with follow-up to ensure that the child was able to obtain the proper services. To support this new service the district also leased a vehicle to provide transportation to and from the center.

The newly opened diagnostic center became the central focus of the district's Title I supportive services programs, all of the Title I supportive services personnel operating from the diagnostic center. However, the district

did continue, with state compensatory education funds to maintain the school-community workers based at the individual schools.

One further change that occurred this year as a result of the opening of the diagnostic center was a shift in the grade level of the children served. Before the diagnostic center opened, the district provided its services to children in the first through the sixth grades with no concentration on particular grades; it now concentrates its services to some extent on children in grades four to six, the group for whom the services of the center have proved most useful.

D. 1975-76

This year the two remaining social workers were dropped from the supportive services program, ending the transition from the professional liaison personnel to the nonprofessional school-community workers. Although the district no longer employs any social workers, the supervisor of the school-community workers does have a background in social work and is available to advise or assist them whenever necessary. Except for the loss of the social workers, the diagnostic center continued operating as before, staffed by the psychologist, the prescriptive teachers for reading and math, and the two nurses.

E. 1976-77

No major changes in the supportive services offered in the district have occured this year. The diagnostic center is operating with the same staff as the previous year, and the school-community workers remain funded by non-Title I sources. This year, however, the district has received some impact area funds which it has used to support the school-community program, reallocating some of the state compensatory education funds to a special instructional program offered in conjunction with a reorganization of the high schools in the district.

III. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES OFFERED IN THE DISTRICT

A. Health Service

Since the opening of the diagnostic center during the 1974-75 school year, the two Title I nurses have provided health services to children tested at the center. Their duties include contacting parents of children selected for testing to obtain medical histories and required parental permission for the testing, providing limited physical examinations to children referred to the center (vision, hearing, dental screenings, hemoglobin, blood sugar, blood pressure tests), consulting with parents on the results of the tests, arranging referrals where indicated by the test results, and following up to ensure that a child's health problems receive appropriate attention.

The health service, like the other services offered at the diagnostic center, is provided only to children eligible for participation in Title I programs. The majority of these children are participating in the Title I instructional programs and are referred by their Title I prescriptive teacher and the principal of their school. The remainder, who are eligible but not participating in the Title I instructional programs, are referred by their regular classroom teacher to Title I prescriptive teachers in their schools for initial testing and verification of eligibility for Title I. The prescriptive teacher, with the approval of the principal, then forwards the referral to the center for the full range of diagnostic testing.

From local funding sources the district currently maintains a staff of six or seven nurses who provide limited health services in all the district's schools. Each school (including the Title I schools) has the services of one of these nurses available to all its students perhaps one day a week. These local budget nurses provide very limited services and even more limited follow-up.

The district's Title I nurses, though they do not have college degrees, have experience in hospital work, basic state certification, and certification as school nurses. Title I funds are not used to provide any special training for the nurses, but the nurses do receive annual in-service training under the supervision of the local budget nursing service. The bulk of the Title I funds expended for the health service are for the nurses' salaries; the remainder goes for travel expenses in connection with home visits and referrals and for the purchase of health testing supplies.

B. Psychological Service

One psychologist, who has an M.A., certification as a school psychologist, and over fifteen years' experience as a psychologist in the district's schools, provides psychological testing services at the diagnostic center. Like the other members of the diagnostic team, he meets with the child's parents to discuss the test results. When the results indicate a need for specialized treatment, the psychologist can refer a child to one of five psychologists provided by the district's local budget, to agencies outside the schools or, in severe cases, to a private child psychiatrist who will see four or five children per month at no charge to the district. Results of the psychologist's testing are also reported to the child's Title I prescriptive teacher or, if the child is eligible but not participating in Title I, to the child's regular classroom teacher, who is responsible for ensuring that any necessary follow-up is provided.

Title I funds (approximately $300) are also used to defray the costs of the psychologist's attendance at at least one professional conference per year.

C. Transportation

This service, offered in connection with the diagnostic center, is simply to provide transportation for students to and from the center. The costs were for leasing a station wagon and for gas and maintenance.

These three services--health, psychological, and transportation--together with the diagnostic services of the prescriptive reading and math teachers, are the main components of the diagnostic center. When a child is referred to the center, one of the nurses will visit the child's home to obtain a medical history and the parents' permission for the testing, to explain the testing to the parents, and to arrange for the parents to visit the center for a discussion of the results of the testing. On the day of the testing, the child will be provided transportation to and from the center, and will be tested by each of the specialists at the center. The results of the tests will be discussed with the parents, and reported to the child's prescriptive or regular classroom teacher in the child's school. The teachers implement instructional programs tailored to the diagnosed academic problems of the child. Where indicated by the tests, referrals for specialized treatment are arranged by the center. The school-community workers are available to assist with the arrangements for the referrals and to make follow-up home visits. The diagnostic center is thus organized to provide each child with concentrated testing and diagnostic services, referral and follow-up. With the transportation support and a centralized facility, the center maintains a continuous and relatively even workload throughout the school year.

D. Social Work

The social workers were hired to serve Title I children during the transition years in which the district was preparing its school-community workers to provide the services formerly offered by the liaison personnel. The primary functions of the social workers (four were employed for the 1973-74 school year, two for the 1974-75 year) were to train the new school-community workers and to provide social work services for children with the most difficult problems.

Their specific services included making home visits and following up on children with attendance problems and arranging referrals to social service agencies and assisting parents and children in their dealings with these agencies. A social worker might, for example, help a family obtain ADC, food stamps, or Medicaid, or arrange for specific help from Good Will or the United Way. Though their Title I budget did not include money for items like food and clothing, the social workers would help children obtain such items either from regular social service agencies and from donations from private individuals.

Prior to the opening of the diagnostic center the social workers operated from the district central offices; they were on-call to all Title I schools, responding to requests from the school principals and Title I prescriptive teachers. With the school-community workers, they were also available for home visits. When the diagnostic center opened, it became the base for their operations for the one year (1974-75) before the social work program was discontinued.

Since they were paid from Title I funds, the social workers served only children eligible for Title I; for the most part these were children actually participating in the instructional programs. All four of the social workers were state certified; two held masters degrees. Though

the state-funded school-community workers do perform many of the functions of the social workers, the district has not provided a professional social worker program from non-Title I sources.

E. School Community Workers (not funded under Title I)

With the exception of the current year, when it is being partially funded by impact area money, this program has been funded from state compensatory education funds. The seventeen positions are filled by nonprofessionals (high school diploma required) each of whom serves one of the seventeen schools in the district that is eligible for Title I. Under guidelines for the state program, the school-community workers can provide services to any child in these schools, whether or not he is eligible for or participating in Title I instructional activities. They offer a variety of services: they provide most of the social work services earlier provided by the liaison personnel and the Title I social workers, arranging and coordinating referrals to social service agencies in the community; they coordinate referrals from the diagnostic center and do some follow-up on children tested at the center; they provide attendance services, checking attendance daily and following up on any child who shows a pattern of absenteeism; and they assist the parent advisory councils in the district's Title I schools by helping to plan meetings, contacting parents and arranging speakers for meetings, and generally assisting the parents in any way possible (without spending Title I money). The respondent estimated that the school-community workers spend about 5 to 10 percent of their time handling referrals from the diagnostic center, another 10 percent in support of PAC activities, and the remainder in social work and attendance services for children referred to them from the schools they serve.

The district has provided extensive training for the school-community workers, particularly during the first years in which the service was offered. The Title I social workers and representatives of a number of cooperating social service agencies conducted a series of workshops to familiarize the school-community workers with a variety of services available in the community and with the procedures for obtaining those services. Before their service was discontinued, the social workers were available throughout the year to assist and advise the school-community workers and provide continuous training. Now, although the Title I social work program is no longer offered, the supervisor of the school-community workers who has a background in social work remains available to provide advice and guidance.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The overall goal of the district's supportive services programs is to help improve the academic achievement of Title I children. For each of the services the district has offered, this general goal has been translated into specific objectives which are amenable in varying degrees to quantitative measurement. Least quantifiable have been the aims of the social workers and the (Non-Title I) school-community workers, whose objectives are to improve the child's attitude toward school and to foster improved home-school relationships and a better home environment.

The objective of the health and psychological services provided through the diagnostic center is to diagnose the physical, social, emotional, and psychological needs of Title I eligible children, to refer children with diagnosed needs for specialized treatment, and, through follow-up

to ensure that those needs are met. Specific objectives set for these programs include an improvement of 10 percent in the attendance rate of children who receive the health services and the psychological testing of a minimum of 200 students each year.

The district's current view of the close relation between the goals of supportive services and instructional Title I services represents a considered change from the goals of its earlier program. When the liaison personnel and social workers were under Title I, a considerable part of the district's Title I effort went into activities designed to improve parent involvement and to provide the various social work services. While the district still sees these services as needed and valuable, it sees them as being only indirectly related to the academic goals of Title I. In commenting on the district's earlier decision to eliminate the liaison personnel from the Title I program, the respondent indicated that the principals in particular had liked the service, but that providing that kind of service "wasn't the purpose of our program." The district's current Title I supportive services, in contrast, are seen as serving essentially the same goals as the Title I instructional programs. The respondent spoke of the diagnostic center as an integral part of the district's instructional program:

> The diagnostic center is so closely related to the instructional program in the way we've got it set up, with the follow-up, with the prescriptive teachers, and with getting the children into the program and so on, it's semi-supportive, but actually it's part of the (instructional) program.

B. Needs Assessment and Program Evaluation

In January of each year the district sends needs assessment forms to all principals and teachers in the Title I schools. On the forms the respondents are asked to rank the areas in which they think Title I help is most needed, and to evaluate Title I services currently being provided.

Invariably, reading and math are identified as the number one and number two priority needs; the ongoing instructional and supportive service programs have received consistently high evaluations, being rated 3 or 4 on a 4-point scale.

Parent input into the needs assessment and evaluation comes in several ways: through contact with the school-community workers, through the local parent councils which meet five or six times a year and the city-wide council which also meets five or six times a year, and through two two-day workshops which the district conducts for the parents each year. In all of these forums the parents have the opportunity to discuss what they perceive as the needs of their children, to evaluate the on-going programs, and to make contributions to the district's planning of future programs. In addition, the district requests that the parents of each child who receives the testing services of the diagnostic center complete a questionnaire evaluating those services. The parents are asked to fill out the questionnaires at home and to return them, unsigned, by mail. The respondent reported that there has been an excellent response rate for completed questionnaires and that the evaluations of the center's services are almost unanimously positive: "We just don't get any complaints on that service."

In general the respondent felt that the district's supportive services are meeting the needs of the Title I children. The local budget nurses and psychologists, and the variety, accessibility, and cooperativeness of private and public social service agencies in the city go a long way toward meeting many of the basic needs of the Title I children. With these agencies, "the cooperation is excellent: almost anything we want we can get." This allows the district to focus its Title I supportive services on diagnosing those problems of Title I children most closely related to the overall academic goals of Title I.

In discussing evaluations of supportive services, the respondent commented at several points on the difficulty of measuring the success of such programs. To get some indication of the effectiveness of the health service, the district measures the improvement in attendance rates for children referred through the center. Beyond its goal of testing a minimum of 200 students per year, the district does not attempt any direct measurement of the effectiveness of the psychologist's services. But because it sees the diagnostic center as tied very closely to the academic aims of the Title I program, it gets some measure of the effectiveness of the center through the test scores recorded in extensive pre- and post-testing of all children who receive the services of the center. Generally, it has been successful in reaching its goal of having 75 percent of the children who receive the services achieve one-half percentile or more improvement for each month in the Title I program.

As suggested previously, one of the considerations in the district's earlier decisions to eliminate its liaison personnel and, subsequently, the social workers, from Title I was the difficulty of measuring the contributions of such programs to the goals of Title I. Speaking of such services, the respondent commented:

> This is one of the problems with that kind of service: it's hard to show any academic gains. . . . We did show some improvement in attendance, but academically . . . just trying to pre-test and post-test and all the other things, . . . it's hard to separate out who did what. . . . This is one of the reasons we plan on staying away from that type of program, because in (this state), anyhow, they're very stringent in their requirements as far as test results, showing some sort of progress for the money spent. And that's hard to do with that.

In contrast, the state agency that reviews proposals and evaluations of programs funded through state compensatory education program is more willing to accept qualitative evaluations by participants and recipients of services than is the state's Title I agency. The district's evaluation

of its school-community worker program, for example, places relatively little emphasis on hard data or test scores and correspondingly more emphasis on subjective judgments as to the effectiveness of the program.

C. Program Planning and Decision Making

On the basis of the needs assessment/evaluation questionnaires filled out by all members of the Title I staff, input solicited from parents and an estimated allocation figure supplied by the state, the district's Title I director and staff draw up a detailed project proposal. Copies of the proposal are printed and distributed to staff and parents. Then, in late spring, the district sponsors a two-day planning workshop attended by parents, Title I staff representatives, and, usually, a representative from the state Title I office. At the meeting the proposal is reviewed page by page; each item in the proposed program is explained and all present have an opportunity to raise questions and suggest changes. After the conference the final proposal is put together, submitted for review and approval by district superintendents and by the Board of Education, and forwarded to the state. The superintendents and Board of Education usually accept the proposal as written by the Title I director and the parents without requiring significant modifications.

Nor has the district encountered problems in obtaining state approval for its proposals. The state officials generally are quite helpful to the district in its planning; they are available to answer questions and will send a representative to the district to provide assistance if requested. Though the state provides no specific rules on how districts should allocate funds between instructional and supportive services, it does hold a "tight rein" on programs within the state. But with the current arrangement of its program and the close relation between diagnostic center and instructional

services, the district has had no difficulty obtaining state approval for its proposal.

The parents have a number of opportunities to influence the shape of the district's Title I program and generally have given strong support to the district's view that instructional programs have top priority; "parents seem to be in complete agreement with the teachers--more reading and more math is what they want. They tell the state department that every year--we want more money to add more reading and math teachers." The majority of the suggestions made by parents have been for the expansion of the ongoing instructional programs or for wider use of particular instructional techniques or approaches (e.g., more use of reading laboratories). As evidenced particularly by the questionnaires completed by the parents of children tested at the diagnostic center, the parents also support the district's current approach to Title I supportive services. (Some parents in fact suggested that the district create a second diagnostic center, but the respondent explained that while there might possibly be sufficient demand to keep a second center busy, the district could not afford to support a second center with its present budget.) At one time another parent also suggested eliminating the two-day workshops for the parents and hiring an additional teacher with the money saved, but the respondent explained that the cost of the conferences (about $800 each) would not begin to cover a teacher's salary. But the parents have not made any "unreasonable or excessive demands of the program." Unlike parents in some other districts, for example, they have not requested payment for the parent advisors to the Title I program or for their own attendance at meetings or even for smaller items such as reimbursement for babysitting expenses incurred when attending advisory council meetings.

> So far, they've never disagreed on anything. But this is really understandable because all through the year we're meeting with them. And so we get suggestions throughout the year, and if there's anything that they would really see that they thought we needed, we would already have incorporated it before.

In response to a question about what would happen if the parents were to disagree with the district's views on the Title I program, the respondent explained that if the parents could not be persuaded otherwise, their alternative suggestion for the program would be written up and submitted to the state along with the district's proposal and a statement of the district's reasons for not accepting the parents' suggestions. The decision on the district's program would then be left to the state. This procedure has been explained to the parents, but they have never had the occasion to use it.

The main decisions affecting the district's supportive services programs in recent years--the decisions to drop the social workers and to concentrate all of the district's Title I supportive services in the diagnostic center--were based on a number of related considerations, including the district's changing view on the priority to be accorded to instructional programs, its perception of a similar change on the part of the state Title I officials, and budgetary limitations.

As noted previously, the prohibitive cost of the liaison personnel was a major factor in the district's decision to provide a similar service through the less costly,nonprofessional school-community workers. The social workers were hired as part of the 'package'--to provide a core staff of professionals to train and assist the school-community workers during the transition period when they were becoming familiar with the variety of services available in the community and the procedures for obtaining those services. By putting the school-community workers under state funds,

the district freed Title I money to support its reading program. Money left over after the reading program was funded was available for the social workers.

Although financial considerations were not the primary criterion used by the district in deciding on the number of social workers to hire (it based that decision on an estimation that a social worker could serve approximately three schools, and thus that four social workers would be needed to serve the thirteen Title I schools), had sufficient funds not been available for both the additional reading teachers and the social workers, the district would have chosen to hire the teachers rather than the social workers. In 1974-75, when the number of social workers was reduced to two, the freed money was used to begin a math prescriptive program. Though as noted in the Introduction, there had been strong opposition when the district first proposed to shift to the school-community and social workers, there was no resistance to the move to reduce the number of social workers,or, the following year, to eliminate them from the program.

> We found that the school-community workers that we pay for under state funds could do what the social workers were doing, so we didn't feel a need for them anymore. The social workers were to help us over the transition period from the professional to the nonprofessional staff. And they did do a lot of work; they trained our school-community workers.

The district currently views its Title I program as basically an instructional program. When distinguishing the diagnostic center as only "semi-supportive" because of its close relation to the instructional program, the respondent described other kinds of supportive services, such as social workers, as "strictly supportive services, as a minor part [of Title I], . . . as something you do when you can afford it." Given a choice between instructional and supportive programs, the district in most cases would go "straight instructional."

The structure of the district's current program also reflects its understanding of the state's position on the priority of instructional services and supportive services that make a measurable contribution to the goals of the instructional services. Describing the state's position, the respondent remarked:

> Title I is an educational program; it was put in originally to help for such things as reading and math, those types of things. And not a social service program. They look upon those services as being more the responsibility of the welfare department or some other agency, than of the schools . . . They think we're getting a little out of our area of expertise when we start into those things, and that we should stick to the academics.

In another comment on the state's view of supportive services, he added:

> I think they would be very hesitant about approving any program that you couldn't give hard data on any more. I don't think we could get a staff of nurses now, for example, We could get a couple. We couldn't fund school-community workers, social workers, that sort of thing. They want some hard data. They feel that when you go to Congress and you're asking for two billion, three billion dollars, across the country, you've got to be able to show what's happening . . . what kind of results (you're getting). You can't say, "well, we <u>feel</u> that these services are good." . . . You'd better have some good hard data that you can show that for every month they're in Title I they gain a month and a half in reading or two months in math . . .

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

In general the district seems satisfied with the current organization and operation of its Title I program. It has data to support its belief that the program makes a measurable impact on the Title I children who are served; they feel that increases in the improvement rate of children who have received the services of the diagnostic center justify their support of that service. Parent support for the diagnostic center and for the Title I instructional program has been quite strong and has carried over into support for the school system as a whole. The respondent mentioned that while several local school levies have been defeated in recent years, they have done much better in the areas of the city where the Title I schools are located than in other areas.

The district is in basic agreement with the state on the emphasis to be given to instructional programs. At the time of the interview, the district had learned that its allocation for next year would increase by some $70,000, and the respondent indicated that the district would most likely commit this addtional money to hiring more instructional staff, particularly for its math program. Were more state compensatory education money available, moreover, the district would most likely commit the impact aid money currently going to support the school-community workers to the Title I math and reading programs.

At present the district has no plans to begin new supportive service programs in the district or to augment the staff of the diagnostic center. Rather, it is giving consideration to eliminating one of the two nursing positions at the center.

Responding to questions about how the district might react to a reduction in its Title I funding, the respondent noted that the first position to be cut would probably be the nurses at the diagnostic center and that if further cuts were required it would be necessary to eliminate the diagnostic center altogether since it would be so emasculated that there would be no reason to keep it. Were Title I to become exclusively a reading and math program, the respondent felt that it might be possible for the district to keep the diagnostic center by shifting its funds--by using Title I money to support the instructional programs now offered in the high schools through state compensatory education funds, and by using the state money to support the diagnostic center.

The district has not experienced any major problems in working with state and federal Title I guidelines. A number of people in the district, however, including some parents of children in non-Title I schools, several members of the School Board, and the district's Title I director,

would like the program to be available to educationally disadvantaged students throughout the city, regardless of family income. They feel that Title I money should be distributed across the school system. "The fact that some children happen to be going to the wrong school shouldn't eliminate them from getting services."

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 12

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. DESCRIPTION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

- A. Health Service
- B. Transportation Service
- C. Community Services
- D. Child-Parent Centers

III. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

- A. Goals of the Supportive Services
- B. Needs Assessment
- C. Program Planning and Decision-Making
- D. Program Evaluation

IV. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

This district, the largest of those studied, serves a major metropolitan area. Its student population is roughly 60 percent black, 25 percent white, 14 percent Puerto Rican and Spanish surnamed, and the remainder American Indian or Oriental. Approximately 25-30 percent of the students in the district are from low-income families.

Currently about half of the public schools in the district are eligible for Title I; approximately two-thirds of these and an additional 15 percent of the non-public schools in the district participate in Title I programs (further information on the selection of schools is provided below in the section on decision-making). Throughout the four year period studied, the district has offered a variety of substantial supportive service programs in the areas of health, guidance and psychological services, social work, food, transportation, and community services. In some of these areas, the services are provided through more than one program. Health services, for example, are provided both through a general program available to all Title I schools and through several separately budgeted special programs that include health service components. Similarly, there is a general transportation program that offers field trips to all participating Title I schools and there is a transportation component provided in support of a number of special programs.

For this report several of the major supportive service programs in the district and one basically instructional program with supportive service

components were selected for study. These programs illustrate the two main channels through which decisions on planning and budgeting for supportive services are made in the district:

(1) Some programs are potentially available to Title I children throughout the district. These programs are selected and "purchased" for their Title I students by the participating Title I schools. Each school is allocated a share of the district's Title I grant (based on the number of Title I students in the school) which it then uses to purchase the specific instructional and supportive service programs to be offered to its students. The size and budget for these purchasable programs are thus determined by the choices of the participating Title I schools. The health, transportation, and community service programs described below are of this purchasable type.

(2) For other programs planning is largely centralized in the district's Title I offices. These programs, which are funded "off the top" of the district's total Title I allocation, are typically available on a limited basis either to Title I children in specific grades in specific areas of the city or to children from throughout the district who come to centralized facilities to receive the services. The pre-school program described below is of this non-purchasable type.

Because of the variety and complexity of the supportive services offered in this district, the format for the remainder of this report deviates slightly from that of the others. In this report the separate chronological narrative is omitted and the sections describing the individual services are expanded to include information on the major changes that have affected these services during the period studied and the problems and considerations that led to these changes.

II. Description of Supportive Services

A. Health Service

The district's Title I health service has been offered since 1966 or 67. Its main function has been to provide physical and dental examinations and limited dental care for selected Title I students in schools purchasing the service. The service is provided by medical examining teams which include a doctor, pediatric nurses, medical technicians, dental hygienists, public health nurses, and health aides. Following a schedule set up early in the school year, the teams travel from school to school, examining an average of twelve children per day.

Under the district's system of purchased services, each target school may select to purchase the service for as many of its students who are participating in Title I instructional programs as it wishes and can afford. In past years there was no minimum number of students for whom the service could be purchased, but, because of the impact on cost-effectiveness when some schools purchased the service for as few as three or four students, the district now requires that the service be purchased for a minimum of twelve students (i.e., one day's examining by a team). Some schools purchase the service for all of their Title I students; others select students on the basis of referrals from Title I teachers, the local budget funded nurse who serves the school, or the school principal.

Prior to the date on which a child is scheduled for the examination, a health aide will contact the child's parents to obtain medical background information and permission for the testing, and to invite the parents to the school for a discussion of the results of the examination. If any health problem is detected during the examination, members of the examining team will explain the problem to the parents, assist in arranging referrals for treatment,

and perform any necessary follow-up to ensure that the child receives treatment. If a child's parents are unable to come to the school, a health aide will make a home visit to explain the results of the examination.

Prior to the 1976-77 school year the health service offered dental examinations and limited dental care. Actual treatment for dental problems would be provided with Title I funds only for children who were not eligible for care through public assistance and who could not pay for the services of a private dentist. These children would be referred to a "cooperating dentist" for treatment. To ensure the adequacy of dental treatment provided for Title I children, funds were also expended for a dental quality control program. For the 1976-77 school year the district eliminated the dental component from from the health services program, primarily because of increasing costs. For this year the basic per-pupil Title I allocation was reduced, and since most schools purchase their instructional programs before selecting supportive services, expenditures for supportive services in general declined this year. Retention of the dental component would have raised the unit cost for the health service by more than 50 percent, and the district therefore decided to limit the health service to the physical examinations. To absorb part of the impact of the cut in dental services, the city's public health agency agreed to provide some dental screening for the district's students.

Overall expenditures for the health service increased significantly when the district first introduced its system of purchased services, reaching a high point during the 1974-75 school year when the budget for the service increased by some 50 percent over the previous year, and the district maintained three full examining teams. During the next two years, however, largely because of increasing costs throughout the Title I program, expenditures for the health service decreased. For the 1976-77 school year the program budget was only slightly more than 20 percent of the 1974-75 level, and the district operated

only one examining team. For the 1977-78 school year the district has increased the per-pupil allocation for Title I and anticipates a sufficient increase in the purchase of the health service to require the staffing of a second examining team.

There are two groups who regularly evaluate the health service. Personnel working with the medical examining teams maintain records on such things as the number of children examined, the health problems detected, and the results of referrals and follow-ups. These records are used for managing the teams' efforts and monitoring the follow-up activities. Information from these records is also forwarded to the district's department of research and evaluation, which prepares the annual evaluation of all of the district's programs. The bureau's evaluation includes a review of the cost-effectiveness of the service.

When asked for comments on the effectiveness of the program, the respondent noted that since there are so many variables affecting a child's health it is most difficult to get any solid measure of the program's contribution to the overall health of Title I children that would allow one to call the program a success. He did mention, however, that most of the schools that purchase the service are sufficiently satisfied that, if money is available, they purchase the service the following year. Though there have been some complaints regarding the delivery of the service (e.g., waiting time for parents who come to the school for their child's examination) and some suggestions from parents of children eligible for free medical care through public aid that money spent on the health program should be spent on other services, the district has received no major complaints about the quality of the service itself.
The non-public schools, which are not served by the public schools' local budget nurses, apparently find the Title I health service particularly valuable, as they tend to purchase it with greater frequency than do the public schools.

B. Transportation Service

The transportation service is operated in support of a field experiences program through which schools can purchase field trips for students participating in Title I instructional programs. The trips are designed as extensions of classroom activities, to provide Title I children with educationally or culturally enriching experiences to which they can relate materials studied at school. Field trips are also provided in connection with several other special programs in the district, and individual schools may have fund raising activities to support field trips for their students, but there is no regular district sponsored program of field trips available to all students.

As presently designed, the Title I transportation program offers two options. Schools can purchase transportation only, in units of $6.00 per child; or they can purchase units that include both transportation and admission fees for $8.00 per unit. The service must be purchased for a minimum of 35 children. It may be purchased for as many Title I students as the school wishes, but no more than one unit ($8.00) may be spent on any one child. A school that uses its allocation to visit local museums or other nearby sites may be able to provide five or six trips for a child during the course of a school year. Some schools choose, however, to spend the entire allocation on a single major trip.

The sites to be visited are selected by the teachers in the participating schools, but the sites must be approved in advance by the school principal, the area superintendent, and the Title I supervisor for the service. Arrangements for buses are made by the schools with one of a number of bus companies previously approved by the district.

The transportation program has been offered since well before the period covered by this study and over the years has gradually evolved toward its

present format. In earlier years all planning for the program was done in the district's central offices. When the schools complained about this arrangement, the district responded by allowing the schools to select sites for half of the trips. At one point the schools pointed out that the lack of money for entrance fees greatly restricted the sites they could visit. For the following year, therefore, the district budgeted a lump sum for admission fees, available to schools on a first-come-first-served basis. When this arrangement resulted in an inequitable distribution of the fee money, the district changed its policy and allocated fifty cents per child for fees. It also allowed the schools to select sites for all of the field trips. During the last few years the basic structure of the program has remained unchanged, though the per pupil allocation for the service has gradually increased to the present level of $6.00 for transportation and $2.00 for admission fees.

The pattern of expenditures for the service as a whole is similar to that for the health services. There was a sizeable increase in the purchase of the service for the 1974-75 school year, followed by a decline the succeeding two years. The decline in the number of schools purchasing the service has been relatively small (12 percent); the greater drop has been in the number of students for whom the service has been purchased (65 percent). The respondent interpreted this drop as a reflection of financial pressures faced by the schools. As the per pupil Title I allocation dropped and the costs for basic instructional programs increased, schools found it necessary to spend a greater proportion of their total Title I allocations for instructional programs.

The respondent mentioned two problems the district has encountered in operating the service. One is that some schools have attempted to purchase the service in greater amounts than allowed. The district resolves this problem by monitoring the schools' requests and disapproving requests that exceed the program guidelines. The other problem is that, because Title I children are

for the most part entitled to free lunches from non-Title I sources, the schools cannot spend money from the transportation budget for food for children on the field trips. This makes it necessary to schedule trips to avoid the lunch hour or to make arrangements for bag lunches for the children.

To evaluate the program each teacher who takes children on a trip is required to complete a questionnaire giving details of the trip, its relation to the children's activities in the classroom both before and after the trip, indicating whether the children enjoyed and benefitted from the trip, and offering general comments about the place visited. The completed forms are reviewed by the Title I office and forwarded to the district's research and evaluation department, where they are used to compile statistical reports on the trips for the district's annual Title I evaluation.

Because of the difficulty of measuring the impact of field trips on a child's reading ability, the program administrators tend to view the program as one that provides an opportunity for children to visit facilities and to be exposed to educational and cultural experiences that would otherwise be unavailable to them. They have had no negative reactions to the program as a whole and have found that the principals and teachers in the Title I schools, the persons who "buy" the service, are quite pleased with the program.

C. Community Services--School Community Representatives

The major objective of this, the largest of the district's purchasable supportive service programs, is "to change attitudes." Since poor attitude toward self or toward school has traditionally been a major problem among children who are low achievers, the district attempts through this program to improve children's attitudes toward school and, through that, to improve their achievement in school.

The service is provided by para-professional school-community representatives who are selected by the principals of the schools they serve and who usually live in the community near the school that each serves. They are required to have a high school diploma, but a major consideration in hiring is an applicant's skills in human relations. The representatives receive a week of training at the beginning of the school year and a half-day of in-service training each month.

The duties of the representatives vary to some extent from school to school. In general their job is to act as a liaison person between the child, his home, and the school--to be someone to whom a Title I child may turn for assistance with school related problems, and to assist the child's parents in their efforts to help the child improve in his studies and in his attitude toward school. They explain the Title I programs to the parents, serve as school resource persons to whom the parents can turn to discuss their children's problems, and provide the parents with information on community resources to which they can turn for additional help for their children. The representatives also serve as resource persons for local parent advisory councils. In working with the councils their primary task is to stimulate parent participation; because of possible conflicts arising from their position as district employees, however, they do not serve as members of the councils.

Each representative serves seventy Title I students on a regular basis. He is required to meet with at least thirty-five children each month, so that each child is seen at least every other month. Students who will receive the service are selected by their school principal on the basis of teacher recommendations. Only students participating in Title I instructional programs are eligible, and in general only those who are most in need of the service (who are two years or more below grade level) are selected.

The school-community representative program has been in operation in the district almost since the beginning of Title I. The district's teachers had expressed a need for greater community involvement and the district central offices took the initiative to begin the program in the summer of 1966 by hiring a basic staff of school-community representatives. Shortly thereafter, additional representatives and a professional staff were added to the program. The program experienced some personnel reductions in the ensuing years, during which the program was organized and funded from the central district offices. Since the introduction of the current system through which this is a purchasable service, however, the size of the program has remained relatively constant. In each of the last four years the program has been operated in about three-fourths of the participating public schools and half of the participating non-public schools in the district. Changes in the program from year to year have resulted primarily from changes in schools' eligibility for Title I. Over the four years since 1973-74 the budget for this program has increased by 6 percent, and the program currently accounts for about 6 percent of the district's total Title I budget.

Each school-community representative maintains a log of his activities and forwards reports based on the log to the program administrators, who use them for supervisory purposes, and to the department of research and evaluation, which uses them in preparing the district's annual program evaluation. The department obtains additional information on the program from questionnaires sent to principals and teachers at Title I schools and to recipients of the service, and by sending staff members to attend the inservice training sessions for the school-community representatives. The respondent noted that, while there is a continual sharing of information between the program administrators and the research and evaluation department, most initiatives for adjustments to the program come from the program's own staff members.

In offering a general evaluation of the program, the respondent described the contribution of the school-community representatives as "positive" and indicated that this has been considered one of the better supportive service programs offered in the district. "This program has been around longer than many of our reading programs. It's a basic program, and losing it would be like cutting off an arm." Without Title I funding, however, the program would be lost: "It's just that simple."

The program has had no significant difficulties with state or federal regulation, but there are two changes the respondent felt advisable: that the district require every Title I school to have at least one school-community representative and that the representatives be given permanent employee status. As non-professionals, they are currently considered temporary employees and accrue no seniority despite the fact that some have worked for the district for as long as ten years.

D. Child-Parent Centers

The child-parent centers are designed to provide school readiness activities and special instructional services for children ranging from preschool age through third grade. The program was originally conceived as a six-year program, in which a child would be enrolled for two years of pre-school, kindergarten, and grades one through three. For reasons discussed below, most of the centers offer only preschool and/or kindergarten activities. For the present study the centers are noteworthy for their parent involvement activities and for the variety of supportive services they provide the children.

The centers are located in facilities separate from the regular district schools, but each is within the attendance area of an eligible Title I school. When selecting sites for the centers, the district has chosen high poverty areas of the city; though the poverty level in the neighborhood surrounding some of the centers has decreased since the locations were originally chosen, in no case has the change been sufficient to affect the center's eligibility for Title I.

Children are selected for enrollment in the center programs only at the preschool level. Since at this level no test scores are available to determine a child's eligibility for Title I, selection is based on a review of the child's family and home situation, through which the district attempts to select those children who are most likely to need extra instructional aid in the classroom. Though in the past some centers accepted applications on a first-come-first-served basis, the centers now advertise throughout the neighborhood when applications are being accepted and all centers now require parents wishing to enroll their children to fill out a pre-assessment questionnaire. The questionnaire obtains information on the child's development and home situation and verifies his residence in a Title I school attendance

area. A school community worker attached to the center may make a home visit to obtain further information on an applicant and to explain the operation of the center to the child's parents. On the basis of the questionnaires and the home visit, the centers select those children determined most likely to encounter academic problems when they reach school age.

The program is designed so that, once accepted, a child will remain in the center program until he has completed the highest year offered at the center he attends. Some of the centers provide instruction for children through the third grade, and this feature of the program has been questioned by state Title I officials. The first regular achievement testing for the students occurs at the end of the kindergarten year. Most children who have been in the program for two years or more score at or above national norms and thus are not 'educationally disadvantaged,' and therefore, according to the state, not eligible for Title I services. In past years the district had relied upon a clause in the guidelines that allowed districts to retain a child in Title I programs on the basis of prior assessments of disadvantagement, but that clause has now been dropped from the guidelines. Thus, after discussions with the state produced no practicable alternative through which the district could keep the first through third grades as part of its Title I centers, and after an unsuccessful search for alternative sources of funding for this part of the program, the district has decided to drop the upper grades and operate the program only through the kindergarten years. Though this will represent a significant change in the structure of the six centers that have offered grades 1 through 3, it will affect only about ten percent of the children currently enrolled in the child-parent centers throughout the city.

The child-parent centers are organized to provide a strong program of preschool learning activities augmented by auxiliary staff services and extensive parent involvement. The purpose of the program is to help children

overcome those factors in their background that tend to contribute to poor academic achievement. In addition to the considerable success the program has had in its primary academic goals, it has produced a number of valuable side-effects on parents participating in the program and on the siblings of the child participants.

Parent participation in the program is mandatory. When a parent enrolls his child in the child-parent center, he (or another adult responsible for the child's care) must agree to spend at least one half-day a week at the center. Parents who fail to fulfill this responsibility are asked to take their children out of the program. Generally, however, parent participation is quite good; some parents, in fact, come to the center daily. Each center has a room set aside for the parents; there is a resource teacher and a special calendar of activities for the parents. Each center has a small budget to provide consumable supplies for parent activities (e.g., to purchase materials for sewing projects or for a parent lunch). Money for admission fees and transportation for parent field trips is also provided at each center.

Supportive services offered through the child-parent centers include social work, community liaison, health, speech therapy, counseling, transportation, and food programs. Some of these activities are little different from the services that may be purchased by the regular Title I schools, but all are funded through the child-parent center budget. Three certified social workers serve the program and each center has its own school-community representative. Though there is some overlap in the services they provide, the professional social workers are used particularly to arrange referrals for children and their parents to the various social service agencies throughout the city. The non-professional school-community representatives, on the other hand, are "community persons" hired largely for their knowledge of, and ability to deal with, parents and groups in the neighborhood served by the

child-parent center. They spend considerable time on recruitment activities and on regular home visits, where they become acquainted with the parents and attempt to spot problems in the home that might affect the child's development, check on attendance problems, and work generally to improve home-school-community relations.

Health services are provided by registered nurses (RNs) and licensed practical nurses (LPNs). In earlier years each of the centers had its own LPN, but this is no longer the case. A requirement that each LPN serve under the direct supervision of an RN led the district to reexamine the need for full-time nurses at each of the centers and, as a result, to reduce the number of LPNs on the program staff. Currently there are six LPNs, each supervised by an RN, who together provide parent education in health and nutrition, arrange referrals to community agencies for children with health problems, do follow-up work for these children, and in some cases provide innoculations.

The speech therapists screen all three-year-olds entering the program to identify speech handicaps or undeveloped speech patterns. Some children with identified problems will be followed by the therapist to ensure that normal development takes place as the child matures; for others, the therapist will devise special speech development activities and exercises that parents or teachers can use to help the child develop. A speech therapist, a social worker, and two nurses (one RN, one LPN) form a team; each team provides coordinated services to a 'cluster' of child-parent centers.

As in the other Title I schools, a field experiences program at the child-parent centers provides funds for admission fees and for transportation to local sites of educational or cultural interest. Teachers with special training in language development and reading readiness provide counseling

services. Each of these teachers serves two schools, coordinating the supportive services activities for those two schools and doing some apecial tutoring. The services of a professional psychologist are available to students at the child-parent centers through a contractual arrangement with a private psychologist.

During January and February of each year the administrators for the program assess their needs for the coming year on the basis of forms filled out at the centers identifying needs for personnel, supplies, equipment, etc. The forms are reviewed at the district central offices and used as a basis for preparing a budget for the child-parent center portion of the district's Title I proposal. In past years the centers had almost no difficulty at all in having their requests incorporated into the district proposal. In the last two or three years, however, as allocations to the regular Title I schools have declined, the child-parent centers have come under some pressure to make cuts. In response to this pressure and to their own recognition that some parts of the program had more staff than necessary, the program administrators have made a number of reductions, particularly among staff for the supportive services. The licensed practical nurses have been cut from 24 to 6; the social workers have been reduced from 6 to 3. Additional reductions in the teacher/counselor staff are being considered for the coming year.

The district is also considering increasing the pupil:teacher ratio, but this change would be effected by increasing the number of children in the program rather than by cutting staff, and thus would not directly affect program expenditures for teacher salaries.

Planning and decision-making for the program varies with issues and time constraints. Much of the detailed budget planning is done by the program administrators in the central district offices. Whenever possible, however, major decisions affecting the program are considered in meetings with the

principals of the child-parent centers and their parent schools and, when appropriate, the teachers, school-community representatives and other staff from the centers. The respondent mentioned, for example, that the principals had influenced the decision to reduce the social work staff. Though the social workers had been providing a valuable service, they had not demonstrated their value to the principals as much as had some of the other staff, and thus the principals were willing to cut several of the social work positions. For the coming year several of the centers will be moving from temporary quarters to space in their parent school buildings; these moves have required numerous meetings and extensive planning and coordination involving central office staff, and staff at both the centers and the parent schools.

Parents have several avenues of access for affecting activities at the centers. As noted previously, parent participation in center activities is a requirement for a child's continued enrollment, and parents take a very active part in setting objectives for their activities and planning their specific projects and field trips. The centers also have had parent councils of their own, but this activity was not discussed during the interview. The respondent did point out, though, that the parents at the child-parent centers now have representatives on the advisory councils at their parent schools, an arrangement that encourages continuity of parent involvement as children 'graduate' from the centers and move into the regular public school classrooms. Since most of the children entering elementary school from the child-parent centers no longer qualify for Title I, there has been some concern lest the gains made in the centers be lost when a child enters the regular classroom. To assist children in the transition to the regular classroom, the district is studying a plan to enlist parent volunteers to work with the center graduates in the regular school classrooms.

Among the problems the program has faced in recent years the most significant have already been mentioned: the difficulties leading to the decision to drop grades one through three from the six centers offering those grades, and the tightening of the program through staff cuts. Other problems noted by the respondent were largely ones associated with managing the program and the budgets for the various services offered at the centers. In recent years, for example, there have been several changes in the allocations for admission fees on field trips and in the budget for snacks for the children. Such changes would result from the district's realization that it had budgeted too much or too little for a service or that the guidelines for expending funds for a service needed tightening.

Formal evaluation of the child-parent centers, as for all of the district Title I activities, is done by the district department of research and evaluation on the basis of standardized achievement test scores (tests are given at the end of the kindergarten and succeeding years) and other program information supplied by the centers. This evaluation, however, has little immediate influence on the district's annual planning, since the evaluation is not completed until after the district's application has been submitted. Program administrators often find it difficult to obtain up to date information from the department and have at times received information indicating the existence of a problem only when it was too late to take steps to correct it.

The achievement level of children who have attended the centers provides evidence that the program has been largely successful. The respondent pointed to the active parent participation as one of the strongest assets of the program. That involvement supports the child's development while in the program and provides a base of parent interest and participation in the child's education that continues as the child enters the regular classroom and as his siblings begin their education.

III. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The district Title I officials look upon education as "more than just reading, writing, and arithmetic," and therefore see Title I supportive services as "an integral and very supportive part of the basic instructional program." Because some children require extra help in developing their basic skills, the district tries to provide "fundable and approvable activities that are directly related to a child's skills in language arts and communications areas." The health service, for example, is offered because "health problems can impede progress in instructional activities." Wherever possible, moreover, the district links its supportive service activities directly to regular classroom instruction. Both when requesting approval for field trips and when evaluating trips already taken, Title I teachers are required to document the instructional activities to which the trips are related. The district's camping program for Title I students is looked upon as an "outdoor education and camping" program because it involves children in classroom activities while at camp. One respondent suggested that supportive services ought even, perhaps, to be "out front," because a child must have basic experiences to which to relate what he learns in class and supportive service activities are one way of providing the experiences that will stimulate a child's interests and motivate him to develop his basic academic skills.

B. Needs Assessment

Since 1973 the district has contracted with an outside agency to conduct the needs assessment for its Title I program. The agency prepares questionnaires for staff and administrators at participating schools, members of the city-wide parent advisory council, and a sample of parents of Title I children. On the

basis of the responses to these questionnaires and a study of the academic achievement test scores for the city's schools, the agency prepares a report on identified needs that is incorporated into the district's Title I proposal. In addition to this formal needs assessment, district personnel consult with the principals, teachers, and parent advisory councils at the participating Title I schools to discuss specific activities needed at each school and the modifications of the district-wide programs that might be necessary to meet the circumstances at each school. Information gathered at such meetings is used by the district in working out the details of the Title I program.

C. Program Planning and Decision-Making

During the early stages of planning each year the district requests that each participating school review its needs and submit to the district offices a list of the activities it wishes to offer in its Title I program. Working with these lists and through additional meetings with representatives from Title I schools, the district administrators design a series of programs and options to meet the needs identified by the schools. Staffing requirements and a unit cost -- which may vary from many thousands of dollars for a particular instructional program to a few dollars per pupil for some of the supportive services -- for each of the programs are determined. Using these, the district prepares a guide containing a description of the programs to be offered, the unit cost to the school purchasing each program, the guidelines on eligibility and the evaluation design for each activity. The guides are distributed to the Title I schools, the schools are informed of their Title I allocation, and each school then selects the programs and activities it will offer its Title I students. For cost-effectiveness the district requires that a school purchase at least a set minimum of certain services with a low unit cost, if the school selects to purchase that service. The district also requires that schools spend no less than 70% of their funds for instructional

services. Beyond these requirements, however, the individual schools are largely at liberty to select the instructional and supportive service programs they wish.

The schools report their selections to the district offices where the selections are compiled and summarized for use in preparing the district's detailed Title I proposal. The administrators supervising the various activities use the compilation to prepare for each activity a budget, staffing requirements, a list of schools that will offer the activity, and the grades of the children who will participate. The information describing each program is then integrated into the district's proposal which is edited, printed, and submitted to the Board of Education for approval. After approval by the Board, the proposal goes to the state for negotiation.

In its dealings with the district the state has over the years developed a number of written and unwritten guidelines to ensure compliance with Title I regulations. State Title I officials visit the district each year to monitor the program and notifies the district of their findings and recommendations both at an exit interview at the conclusion of the visit and in a subsequent written report, to which the district responds. The state's report may deal with questions about compliance with federal regulations or about ways in which the district's actual program appears to deviate from what was approved in the district's proposal, e.g., where more or fewer children than stated in the proposal are receiving a particular service. In some cases the state simply requests a written explanation or additional justification for some aspect of the district's program. The district sees the state's role as one of determining the district's compliance with Title I regulations rather than as one of determining the content of the district's programs. The senior respondent for the district could not recall any activity included in the district's proposals that the state had

refused to approve:

> . . . We interpret the rules and regulations fairly well and we pretty much know what we can and cannot do. We don't try to extend the rules and regulations, so we don't present anything to the state that creates any real problems for them or would reach a point where they had to consider whether or not to approve an activity.

In the past the state has suggested that the district make a greater effort to plan its supportive service programs with an eye to services available from community agencies outside the schools. The respondent pointed out that the district's system of purchased services allows the Title I schools to do just that, i.e., to select services on the basis of needs assessments that take account of services available in the neighboring communities. He also added that while there are many services available in the city, there are also such great numbers of people to avail themselves of those services "that they are not so readily accessible as they might seem." In planning its Title I services, therefore, the district attempts "to assure that that child gets the services."

Questions of supplanting and comparability have been raised informally in the district's discussions with the state, but these questions have never led to the state's refusing to approve a service or activity proposed by the district: "We've not been pressured . . . . We do not present anything that we're not certain we are defensible with."

In preparing the budget for its Title I proposal the district first allots funds for its non-purchasable services, that is, the services provided directly through the district's central Title I offices, such as administration, supervision, editorial and communications services, and research and evaluation, and those activities which provide services to students and parents on a district- or area-wide basis. After allocating money for these services, the

district considers alternative ways of allocating the remainder to the participating Title I schools.

The schools eligible to participate in Title I are determined on the basis of a study performed under contract by a private agency. Using 1970 census and current AFDC data(and a weighting factor that emphasizes the more current AFDC data), the agency determines the poverty ranking of the district's schools. Any school in which the percentage of students from low-income families equals or exceeds the district-wide average is eligible for Title I.

The district then prepares to select target schools by calculating how many schools can be served if the past year's per pupil Title I expenditure is maintained and how many can be served if that amount is varied by several different amounts. The resulting possibilities are then presented to the area-wide parent advisory council:

> . . . And we say, "We can serve 'x' schools" -- and we don't let them see what schools we're talking about -- "if we give this amount per pupil; and we can serve 'y' schools at that amount." Then we let them make a recommendation. We tell them what our recommendation is; they may buy our recommendation, they may not. Normally we ask them for a first and second choice.
>
> We then come back and take it to the district superintendents and present them with the administration recommendation and the parents' recommendation -- and they make the final decision. The superintendents don't know what schools are involved (before they make their decision) either.

Once the target schools have been selected, the number of eligible students in each school (those testing a year or more below grade level) and the per-pupil allocation determine each participating school's allocation. Each participating school (principal, with input from staff and parents) then uses its allocation to purchase the instructional and supportive services it will offer. Though the schools are prohibited from spending more than 30% of their allocation for supportive services, they are free to select the services

they will offer and the students who will receive those services. Some Title I students may thus participate in several supportive services; others may not participate in any services. Participation in supportive services activities is, however, "very definitely" limited to students participating in Title I instructional programs.

A school's selection of students to participate in supportive service programs will occasionally result in complaints from the parents of children not selected, but such complaints have not been a major problem for the district. Since such complaints would normally be directed to the principal of the child's school, the district staff personnel who were interviewed did not have available any specific information on the frequency of such complaints. One respondent did indicate that while there is "concern" about the problems that come with having to select students for services, "generally people understand. . . that there aren't sufficient funds to serve all eligible students . . . . We can't get sufficient funds even to provide instructional programs for all the students that are eligible."

Since the district's program purchasing system leaves considerable leeway to the participating schools, it is possible that the demand for particular services will change markedly from one year to the next. Generally, however, the district has found that changes in the demand for its supportive services are due less to shifts in the popularity of the various services than to changes in schools' eligibility for Title I or to changes in a participating school's funding allocation. A school that selects a supportive service one year will usually purchase some amount of that service for the following year unless, as a result of the district's annual determination of target schools, the school is dropped from Title I altogether.

The more frequent source for variations in the level of supportive services offered in the district is a change in the funds allocated to schools to purchase services. For the current school year, for example, the district reduced the per pupil Title I allocation by 16 percent and experienced, as a result, a considerable drop in expenditures for supportive services. The cut in funds, coupled with increasing costs for instructional programs (particularly in teachers' salaries), led many schools to reduce the number of students for whom they purchased supportive services. Thus, this year there was a drop of over 25 percent in the number of students participating in the field experiences program, but a drop of only 6 percent in the number of schools purchasing the service. The health service, which has a relatively high unit cost, has experienced a drop of over 85 percent in the number of students receiving the service and of over 40 percent in the number of schools offering it in the years since 1974-75. This drop has required significant reductions in staffing for the program: elimination of two of three examining teams.

The district's planning for the 1977-78 school year provides a further indication that the level of supportive services follows the level of available funds. For next year the district has decided to increase the per-pupil Title I allocation by about $40, and a preliminary review of the schools' selections for next year indicated that a substantial part of this increase will go for supportive services. The district now anticipates, for example, restoring one of the health examining teams previously cut from the health service program. In short, "the ups and downs (of the supportive services programs) seem to be related to the number of dollars the schools receive."

Variations in the purchase of supportive services sometimes result in considerable personnel turnover, such as that in the health program.

> Every person who is employed in a Title I activity -- other than in the classroom -- is employed with the understanding that his position is contingent upon funding. Now, what we mean by funding isn't necessarily funding from the federal government, but the funding level that we provide the schools and the level at which the schools spend to purchase activities. So that if the activity is decreased and is not required to have 'x' number of staff, then that (excess) staff is deleted.

The lack of job security creates some problems for the district when it attempts to fill vacancies. The difficulties are greatest in filling positions requiring specialized skills such as those of the doctors in the health service or the speech therapists who work with the pre-school program. Lack of job security also affects the morale of employees like the school-community representatives, who, as non-professionals, are not protected by seniority or civil service. Though a representative may have worked in the Title I program as long as ten years, should the school he serves cease to be a Title I school, his position would be lost.

D. Program Evaluation

As noted previously, formal evaluation of the district's Title I programs is provided by the department of research and evaluation, which is located in facilities separate from the central Title I offices. Time did not allow interviews with personnel in this department; information gathered in interviews with the supportive service program administrators indicated that the formal evaluations have relatively little impact on the ongoing programs. Supportive service personnel provide regular reports to the evaluators, and the evaluators collect further information through questionnaires sent both to those who provide the various services and those who receive them, and through observation of the programs. The results of standardized achievement tests are, of course, also processed by the department. But, at least in part because the results

of one year's evaluation are not available when the district plans its program for the following year, several respondents mentioned that the evaluation is of limited use as a source of suggestions for program modification.

Continuous informal evaluation of the supportive service programs is provided by the program administrators. Since all of the services studied for this report have been offered in the district for a number of years, there is a consensus that the programs are, in general, useful and effective. The informal evaluations are therefore performed largely for the purpose of managing ongoing programs, e.g., to maintain or improve the quality of the existing services or to operate the services more efficiently. The respondent who provided information on the district's Title I program as a whole indicated that the supportive services "have pretty much come up to our expectations." He added, however, that evaluations of the supportive services necessarily require some reliance on individual judgments, that it is extremely difficult to measure the contribution of such services to children's cognitive development.

IV. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

In commenting generally on the adequacy of the district's Title I program and the problems the district faces in providing Title I services, the primary respondent expressed conflicting feelings. On the one hand he mentioned a feeling of "helplessness" that comes when he compares what ought to be or what would be necessary to fully meet the needs of Title I children with what can, in practice, be provided. On the other hand, however, he spoke of being accepting of and comfortable with the program the district has been able to offer and of seeing few aspects of the present program that he would wish to

have changed.

Among the aspects of the program that he would like to see changed he mentioned the requirement for an annual determination of eligible schools. "We can have schools on this year and off next year, and back on the next year; or off two years and then back on. . . . . We have six schools that are currently being served that will not be served next year." This shifting of eligible schools each year disrupts the continuity of services to many children and remains "one of our biggest problems." As a partial remedy he suggested that once a school is funded for Title I for a given fiscal year it should be guaranteed that it will receive funding for at least three years.

In response to a question on whether the district has experienced problems with children who receive Title I instruction and services one year and return to the regular classroom the following year, only to slip back and become eligible for Title I once again, he noted that the district has had to face a closely related problem in its child-parent centers. Children who enter a child-parent at age three or four are usually performing at grade level by the time they are ready for first grade, and are thus no longer eligible for Title I instruction when they enter the elementary grades. As noted earlier, several of the child-parent centers include instruction for grades one through three. The state objected to this facet of the program and the district has decided to drop the three grades from the program. That decision has met with strong objections from the community and from the staff at the centers. The respondent pointed out, however, that while he appreciates the feelings of those who have objected to the decision, he understands that Title I programs are intended to provide extra help for children who are performing below grade level. He therefore tends to agree with the argument that when a Title I child has reached grade level it is time to provide Title I services to another child who is still below

grade and has not yet had the benefit of special instruction.

In response to a final question on whether the district might be able to find alternative sources of funding for its supportive service programs should Title I become solely an instructional program, the respondent estimated the district's chances as "probably a minus zero." Since even the regular local budget programs in the district's schools are less than fully funded, he saw no likelihood that state or local money could be found to maintain supportive services.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY #13

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE
   A. Pre-1973
   B. 1973-74
   C. 1974-75
   D. 1975-76
   E. 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
   A. Transportation
   B. Community Services
   C. Health Services

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION
   A. Goals
   B. Program Decision-Making
   C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

V. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

I. Introduction and Highlights

This district serves an inner city in a large metropolitan area, maintaining roughly 150 public schools to serve a student population that has declined from over 93,000 students in 1973-74 to approximately 85,000 in the current school year. Student enrollment in 40 non-public schools in the district has remained between 8,000 and 10,000 during the same four year period. Approximately 85 percent of the student population are black; some 30 percent are from low-income families.

The district currently provides Title I instructional programs in 63 public and 2 non-public schools, with 10,500 public and 150 non-public students participating in the programs. The district uses AFDC figures (supplemented in 1973 with free lunch data) to select its Title I schools, selecting for Title I those elementary schools in which the percentage of AFDC children exceeds the district wide percentage. Instructional programs are provided in all eligible schools. Individual participants for the programs are selected on the basis of academic achievement scores, with those students falling below the cut-off point but above the EMR level being accepted for the instructional programs. Although most of the students who have been designated as educationally disadvantaged participate in Title I, some schools do have short waiting lists of students who scored in the higher ranges below the cut-off point for Title I eligibility. These students are admitted to the instructional programs as openings become available. All students participating in the basic Title I reading program are eligible to participate in the one supportive service presently offered for students in the program--a transportation service. A community services program supports parent participation in Title I activities.

The district's basic Title I allocation increased gradually during the period studied, but its actual expenditures dropped sharply--by approximately $1.2 million--between the 1974-75 and 1975-76 school years. In 1973 the district received a large sum of previously impounded funds, which it expended over the next two years. By 1975-76 these funds were exhausted and, in order to retain as many of its staff as possible with only the basic Title I grant, the district was forced to severely trim the non-personnel costs in its budget.

During the period studied the district committed only a small portion of its Title I budget to supportive services: less than one percent for 1973-74 through 1975-76 school years, and only slightly more than one percent for the 1976-77 school year. The district's concentration on instructional services during these four years represents a significant shift from earlier practice. In previous years the district offered supportive service programs in social work, psychological evaluation and counseling, attendance, food, and health services. But for a variety of reasons, including budgetary constraints and guidance from state Title I officials, the district phased out these programs. Currently it offers only two supportive services: transportation and community services.

II. Chronological Narrative

A. Pre-1973

In years preceding the period covered by this study the district offered a variety of supportive services as part of its Title I program. Although detailed figures on these programs were not obtained during the interview, the respondents did indicate that the district had committed a much larger share of its Title I budget to supportive services than it does

currently. In 1965, for example, the district had ten Title I elementary school counselors, but budgetary problems forced it to phase out the program in succeeding years, shifting the counselors to Title I teaching positions or to counseling positions on the local budget as these became available. At other times the distirct's supportive service programs included a test coordinator, a health services coordinator, five psychometrists, and 24 social workers. These positions were all removed from the Title I budget prior to 1973-74 as a result once again of budgetary problems (annual salary increases in a budget that is 85 percent salaries) and of directives from the state ("The state . . . felt that testing and the various services were the business of the . . . regular school system.") At one time the district used Title I money to pay for lunches for some of the Title I students, but this food service was discontinued completely in early 1970 because "we were violating guidelines." The problem here was that the district had been using an educational criterion to select students for the free lunches under Title I when those children might have been directly eligible under the poverty criterion of the free lunch program: "we were supplanting services."

In the early 1970's the district also employed as many as 30 attendance aides to work in the Title I schools with the highest rates of attendance problems. The district found, however, that "principals had varying ideas on how to improve attendance" and sometimes used the aides in roles only indirectly related to attendance; it also found that the program was having little effect and decided to discontinue it in 1972.

Most of the supportive services that were phased out of Title I were taken over and funded to some extent from other federal, state, or local funding sources. The federal Free Lunch Program continues; the district

now provides some social work services and psychological testing from state and local funding. But these latter programs are limited by budgetary constraints of their own. Though the programs phased out of Title I were to have been funded from other sources without significant loss of services, state and local funding has not been adequate to avoid some losses. There is, for example, a long waiting list for children who are to receive diagnostic testing.

B. 1973-74

During this year the district offered two supportive services, transportation for field trips taken by students in the Title I reading program, and a limited health service that provided eyeglasses and hearing aids to Title I children. During the summer following this school year the bus service was also provided for students participating in Title I instructional and camping programs.

C. 1974-75

This year only the transportation service was offered. During the regular school year it provided busing for field trips; during the summer it was used to transport Title I students to instructional programs and an additional 350 handicapped children to a camping program. The health service was not offered this year. Although it had been offered in the district for a number of years, it was discontinued this year at the direction of state Title I officials on the ground that the service was available from other, non-Title I sources.

D. 1975-76

By the beginning of this year the impounded funds which had been released to the district for the 1973-74 school year had been exhausted. Although the district's basic Title I grant increased slightly, and the district was forced to cut back its spending in a number of areas, particularly the non-personnel costs in its budget. Among items cut were the transportation service for the field trips and all summer programs.

During this same year, however, the district intensified its efforts to involve parents in its Title I programs and, for the first time, budgeted some of its Title I funds (approximately $6,000) for community services. These expenditures in support of parent activities did not include any personnel costs, since the organizing efforts were provided by Title I staff holding other teaching or administrative positions.

E. 1976-77

For the current year the district again offers two supportive services: (1) at the urging of teachers and parents, the transportation service for field trips has been restored to the budget. A further increase in the district's basic Title I allocation and the availability of some impact area aid under PL 874 for use in support of Title I activities made it possible for the district to restore the field trips without reductions in other programs. For the coming summer the district is again planning to offer summer programs for which the transportation service will be used, including an expanded camping program. (2) This year the district has further increased its support for community services. The budget this year includes the salary of a full-time coordinator hired to supervise the district's continuing effort to improve parent participation in Title I.

III. Description of Services

A. Transportation

As an extension of its basic Title I reading program, the district provides for participating students one field trip each year to a local site of educational interest. Title I classroom teachers plan the trips, contract for bus transportation through the district offices, and, with parents, accompany the children. The budget for this service covers only the cost of the contracted bus services; salaries for the Title I teachers who accompany the children are covered in the budget for instructional services. No comparable field trips are provided by the district from other funding sources.

The district has also used the transportation service in support of its summer instructional and camping programs.

B. Community Services

The Title I Community Services program supports the activities of the parents' advisory committees in the district. Funds are expended to defray the cost of transportation for parents attending PAC meetings, for light refreshments at the meetings, to support a quarterly newspaper for the PAC, to provide workshops for parents in four Title I areas within the city, and to pay the expenses of parent representatives attending meetings or conferences outside the district. The budget now includes the salary of one full-time staff coordinator, a man with considerable experience in organizing and developing local community groups, who works to strengthen and maintain parent involvement in the Title I program. The coordinator has been giving particular attention to the advisory committees at the individual school level because, though the district-wide PAC has been active for a number of years, the committees at the school level have frequently been unable to generate sufficient parent involvement.

C. Health Service (discontinued after 1973-74 school year)

Through this limited service ($7,500 for 1973-74) the district used Title I funds to purchase eyeglasses and hearing aids. Vision and hearing screenings were conducted throughout the district by non-Title I personnel. If a Title I child was found to have a sight or hearing problem and could not get assistance through Medicaid or other sources, Title I funds would be used to purchase the necessary eyeglasses or hearing aids. There were no costs for Title I personnel in the budget for the health service.

IV. Program Planning and Evaluation

A. Goals of the Supportive Services

In general, the district has looked upon supportive services as a way of doing whatever is necessary to enhance its basic skills instructional programs and to meet, wherever possible, the needs of children participating in the Title I program. Though previously the district attempted to meet a wide variety of needs through its Title I programs in health, psychological testing, social work, attendance, and food services, the goals of its current services programs are necessarily more limited. With its transportation program it tries to provide an enriching field trip experience that relates the in-school reading activities of Title I children to resources and places of interest in the local community. Through its community services the district's goal is to strengthen the involvement of parents in planning and implementing the district's Title I program.

B. Decision-Making

In planning its Title I program from year to year, the district conducts a needs assessment based on standardized achievement test scores and written comments and recommendations provided by principals, Title I staff, local budget teachers, and parents of Title I children. Parents'

input into the process is from three sources: through the advisory committee at each of the Title I schools, through the district-wide advisory committee, and through a Parent Executive Board. This Board, composed of ten parents who have been very actively involved in Title I, gives the parents a voice in the detailed planning of the programs in a way that is impossible through area-wide committee meetings that attract large numbers of parents from Title I schools throughout the district. With the Parent Board, members of the Title I staff put together the district's proposal for the coming year. Although suggestions made by the Parent Board are subject to approval by district officials, their input is considered "a very strong recommendation." Before the completed proposal is submitted to the state, it is reviewed by the district-wide advisory committee, a district committee (which includes the superintendent and assistant superintendents and comptroller), and the School Board. Throughout the planning process the administrators who must approve the proposal are kept informed of its development and their views are taken into account in the planning, so that, although they do carefully review the completed proposal, they are unlikely to require major changes. In contrast, the members of the School Board usually do not involve themselves in the details of the proposal; in effect, they approve the district's request to submit a proposal for a Title I program.

During planning, district officials may also contact state Title I officials for answers to specific questions or advice on what programs the state will approve. As one respondent noted, the state is "very cooperative in so far as working with us . . . and we try to work with them, too. There's no use in writing something they're not going to approve."

Though many parties participate in planning the district's Title I program, the constraints within which planning takes place are such that

there is relatively little leeway for consideration of dramatic changes or major additions, particulary in the supportive service programs. Using a planning figure of 95 percent of its previous year's allocation, the district first determines how many children it can serve (allocating roughly one half of the per child expenditures from local sources for each Title I child). It determines which children are to be served (using standardized test scores) and the eligible schools (using povery criteria). It then allocates staff for instructional programs according to the distribution of eligible children in the eligible schools, at a ratio of one staff person for each 85 children. Following the system policy that "whatever program is available has to be available to all the (Title I) schools," the district commits the bulk of its Title I funds to ongoing reading and math instructional programs. The remaining funds are then considered for allocation to supportive services. At this point, the basic question for a service such as transportation is 'how many trips can we afford?'

The subordinate place given to the consideration of supportive services within this planning process is the result of a number of distinct but overlapping and mutually reinforcing factors. These factors include general state guidelines, the precedent of specific restrictions set down by the state, the district's interpretation of state guidelines, the district's own guidelines and priorities, and the availability of services from non-Title I sources. That the place given to the consideration of supportive services in the district reflects in some measure the views of both the state and the district is suggested by the following comment:

> . . . it's not that we don't need supportive services or couldn't possibly come up with some very good supportive service programs, but our state Title I agency who approves our proposal is very strict in what they will approve, and the state priority is basic skills--instructional areas--and that's really our greatest need. So it works out that almost all of our program is geared toward instructional services.

The state's general Title I guidelines place great emphasis on the priority of basic instructional programs; it was state initiative that led the district to begin a math instructional program in ten schools during the 1974-75 year, a program which has now been expanded into all of the district's Title I schools. In placing emphasis on basic skills, moreover, the state sets some restrictions on the resources or materials that can be used in basic programs. One respondent noted, for example, that the state took exception to the district's use of science materials in one of its summer reading programs because the use of such materials amounted to teaching science rather than basic reading.

Specific state directives prevent the district from offereing health-related supportive services. According to the state, such services are to be provided from local sources, and, indeed, at about the time that the district was instructed to discontinue its health service, the state was instituting a program designed to provide adequate funding for a variety of services. The district's problem, however, is that this program was not fully funded, and thus, though most of the services formerly offered under Title I continue to be provided from non-Title I sources, there has been some decrease in the level of the services provided to Title I children. It is now more difficult for Title I children to obtain eyeglasses and hearing aids than previously (more red tape); there is a long waiting period for diagnostic testing; and currently the district is experiencing difficulty in arranging physical examinations and nursing services for the children who will attend its summer camping program.

Although directives from the state were important factors in the district's decisions to drop the supportive services it offered in the past,

the district's current concentration of its Title I program on basic instructional services does reflect district priorities as well as those of the state. Standardized test scores for the district and the state are generally below national norms. The district has been told by the state to emphasize reading and math, but the district itself recognizes that:

> . . . this is our greatest need, so we really could not justify money on something else. These [reading and math] are the state priorities and the [school] system's priorities. So really [the question of supportive services] is not that much of a problem, since when we've provided these services [reading and math] there's not been that much left over for supportive services anyway.

Given this present committment to instructional services, it is not clear that the district would attempt to reintroduce large supportive service programs even if the state were to change its guidelines. Under present conditions supportive services will likely remain but a small part of the district's Title I program.

The parents of the Title I children accept the district's priorities and understand the budgetary constraints on the program, and thus they have not actively advocated adding new supportive services or restoring the services offered in the district before the 1973-74 school year. They have, however, played a large role in keeping the district's transportation service. After budgetary limitations forced the district to eliminate the field trips during the 1975-76 school year, for example, parent recommendations played an important part in the district's decision to restore the program this year. Again, two years ago the state initially refused to approve a summer camping program for handicapped children but reversed its position after numerous calls to state officials from the children's parents.

C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

The need for the transportation service follows from the district's prior determination of the need for the activity or program--the field trips and the summer programs--to which the transportation is to be provided. The field trips have been offered in the district for a number of years and are seen as a culturally enriching experience for Title I students and as a means of reinforcing the basic reading program. The district's annual evaluation includes a descriptive report on field trips taken during the year, but no attempt is made at deriving a quantative measure of the effectiveness of the trips. There is strong support for the trips within the district, however, and, as noted above, it was complaints and recommendations from parents and teachers that provided impetus for the district's decision to restore the transportation service after it had been dropped during the 1975-76 school year.

Indications of the need for the district's health service--the eyeglasses and hearing aids--would have come from the screenings conducted with local budget funds or from teacher referrals. Since the service is now provided from alternative sources, it is no longer needed under Title I, but the district has found the present procedures for delivering the service more complicated and cumbersome than they were under Title I.

The fact that parent advisory committees at the individual school level were not functioning effectively made the district aware of the need for additional effort in the area of community services.

> . . . It's been a major thrust toward having a parent's advisory committee in each school, starting in FY 76. We had always said that they should have them, but it's awfully hard for the principal in some of the neighborhood schools to get parents to come to the school, and if he got them to come to one or two PTA meetings during the year he felt he had really accomplished something. But to get them to come back for the Title I meetings was an extra burden, and some principals were more successful than others.

When Title I money became available, the district increased its support for parent activities, and as a result all Title I schools in the district now have actively functioning parent advisory committees. The program director has made special efforts to involve the parents and keep them informed on the various aspects of the Title I program. The district's efforts in support of parent activities have fostered the development of a cooperative relationship between district and parents in which the parents participate in planning, understand the limitations on what the district can do with its Title I programs, and do not make excessive demands of the system.

The respondents for the interview could not recall any significant criticism of the two supportive service programs now offered in the district. With the services taking up such a small part of the total Title I budget, there has been no serious objection that the funds used for these services should be transferred to instructional services. There have been suggestions that more might be spent for the supportive services, but, given the district's priorities, these have not been strongly urged. The parents, for example, have not advocated major increases in the community services budget. In answer to a question whether the district had ever had to turn down a specific recommendation for supportive services from the Parents Advisory Committee, one respondent commented:

> . . . when we talk with the parents, we say we know that the state will fund reading and math and we know that these are the priorities of the state, and we know these are the priorities of the [school] system. And we will have a small amount of money left over. So they understand our situation and they haven't made demands. . .
>
> We didn't say" 'Here it is, $ xxxx, how would you spend it?' From the Title I guidelines, the federal regulations, you would think that you could do that, but when you get right down to it, there's not much choice involved--for anyone. . .

When asked a related question about whether the district had ever considered concentrating its Title I program in fewer schools or on fewer students, another respondent commented only very generally that it would be very difficult to take programs out of schools where they have been operated for a number of years.

V. Summary: Plans and Problems

For the immediate future the district expects to continue its transportation and community services programs, with greater concentration of effort on the community services. Rather than create new programs for the parents, the district hopes to improve the services currently being provided and through them to further strengthen the involvement of the parents, particularly at the local school level. For the expanded camping program to be offered this summer, the district plans to hire a nurse and personnel to supervise recreational activities, but at the time of the interview, many of the arrangements for the camping program were still unsettled.

Though at this time, the district has no plans for additional new supportive services, the respondents were able to identify several areas in which there remain needs that, given fewer restrictions on planning and/or greater funding, might be met through Title I supportive services. These include needs for improved health and health education, for additional diagnostic testing, for additional parent education, and for added enrichment activities appended to the basic instructional programs (e.g., additional field trips, a weekend camping program, a program to give paperback books to Title I children).

When asked about problems the district has encountered in planning and operating its Title I programs, the respondents mentioned the 'restrictions' imposed by budget limitations and by state and district emphasis on basic instructional programs. These restrictions have resulted in a reading program that emphasizes the use of basal readers as opposed to more varied materials that might be used for reading instruction ("They want you to stick to reading is reading is reading.") Other district guidelines restrict the use of outside consultants for training teachers in the Title I program, and limited funds preclude much travel by teachers to attend conferences and workshops outside the district. One respondent pointed to this as a significant problem since, though there are funds available for in-service training provided by district personnel, the size of the district staff has been decreasing in recent years, with few new faces or new ideas coming into a relatively 'closed' school system.

One other problem mentioned was the restrictions on the activities of Title I teachers whose salary is paid completely by Title I and who are thus unable to perform some of the duties required of local budget teachers (playground, lunchroom supervision, etc.). The district understands, however, that if it were to fund a portion of the Title I salaries from local sources, the Title I teachers could be made available for such duties. But it has not attempted to do so.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 14

OUTLINE

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE
- A. 1973-74
- B. 1974-75
- C. 1975-76
- D. 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES
- A. Health Services
- B. Guidance and Psychological Services
- C. Community Services (parent involvement)
- D. Attendance Counseling

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION
- A. Goals
- B. Decision-making Process
- C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS, AND FUTURE PLANS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

The district is located in an older urban area with a population of 325,000. Currently, there is a total of approximately 81,000 students enrolled in the district schools--74,000 in public schools and 7,000 in non-public. This total enrollment represents a decrease of almost 10,000 students from 1973-74. Of the 54 attendance areas in the district in 1974-75, 46 have been designated eligible for Title I funds on the basis of having more than 50 percent of the student body from low-income families, according to the AFDC count. These 46 areas contain 63 public schools and 11 non-public schools which offer instruction in grades kindergarten - 9. In 1974-75, the student enrollment in the 74 schools which qualified for Title I programs accounted for more than 85 percent of the total district-wide enrollment. Although similar statistics are not available for the other years in the study period, the respondent characterized 1974-75 as a typical year in terms of the number of students and schools participating in Title I programs. Thus, even though overall enrollment has declined in the district, there has not been a corresponding decline in the numbers of students enrolled in Title I schools or in the numbers of schools and students eligible for Title I services.

Supportive service programs in health, guidance and psychology, and attendance counseling were offered in all qualifying public and non-public Title I schools in 1973-74 and 1974-75. The health and guidance and psychology services were administered from a central special services office, from which Title I staff were assigned to individual schools, with those schools in greatest need of the service receiving a larger allocation of personnel time.

Title I funded services in these areas were provided as concentrated, supplementary services to local budget-funded programs in health and guidance and psychology. Title I funding for these services was lost after the 1974-75 school year because the district was unable to demonstrate that the Title I programs were not in fact supplanting the local budget funded programs. (Supportive services in health and guidance and psychology are still provided under Title I funds during the summer when the local budget funded programs are not in operation.) During the four year study period only the community service program has been continually in operation during the regular school year.

The two most striking events in the history of Title I supportive services in the district are the curtailment of the health, guidance and psychology, and attendance counseling programs at the end of 1974-75 and the increase in the scope of the community service program at the beginning of that same year. According to the respondent, decisions by the state and changes in federal guidelines were the major causes, respectively, for each of these events. As a result of these changes, the supportive service program funded under Title I accounts for 1 percent of this year's total Title I budget; in 1973-74 supportive services accounted for 6 percent of the budget.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74

Title I supportive service programs, accounting for 6 percent of the total Title I budget, were provided in four major areas during this year: health, guidance and psychology, attendance counseling and community service.

The health and guidance and psychology services were provided during the regular school year as concentrated supplements to similar services funded by the Board of Education and were also offered during the summer. Health services included dental and medical screening, nutrition education, referrals for treatment and some actual treatment. Guidance and psychological services included assessment and diagnosis as well as home visitations, some counseling, and referrals to other agencies by a child guidance center. In addition, a youth development clinic provided psychiatric services on a contract basis. For the Title I program all of these services were administered through a centralized special services office; the services were provided in all Title I eligible schools. The community service program sponsored workshops and a citywide conference for Title I parents, the purpose of which was to inform parents about Title I programs and facilitate their participation in the PAC's.

B. 1974-75

The four services provided in the preceding year continued in operation in all Title I designated schools. This year these programs accounted for 8 percent of the total Title I budget, an increase of 2 percent from last year. This increase may be attributed to the widened scope of the community service program. Its budget was increased dramatically this year in order to meet the requirement mandated by federal guidelines that more substantive efforts be made to facilitate parent participation in Title I activities. Paraprofessionals from the community were added to the program to work with local PAC's as consultants and organizers. In addition, parents were reimbursed for travel and per diem expenses incurred in the course of PAC duties; workshops and conferences were expanded; and, a training program to inform PAC members of federal and state guidelines were instituted.

C. 1975-76

This year only the community service program was in operation during the school year. As a result supportive services were reduced to 2 percent of the total Title I budget. The other school-year programs in health, guidance and psychology, and attendance counseling were discontinued because the district was unable to demonstrate that these programs, which the district considered to be concentrated supplements to similar services provided by the local funds, were in practice not supplanting the locally funded services. Because locally funded programs in these areas are not offered during the summer session, services in health and guidance and psychology continued to be offered under Title I funding during the summer.

The supplanting issue is a knotty one. On the one hand, the respondent maintained that there was no supplanting, "but there were a lot of innuendoes." On the other, he felt that the state's decision not to allow the district to fund health, guidance and psychology, and attendance counseling programs was a justified and correct one.

The problem appears to have been one of comparability. Title I health and guidance and psychology personnel kept careful records of the numbers of children seen and treated, but local budget personnel did not keep such records. Chiefly because of the local budget personnel's refusal to keep the necessary records ("They felt it to be an extra job") the state could not determine what services were truly supplementary and which were supplanted. As a result, it was impossible to show that Title I personnel were not actually performing the duties of local budget personnel.

The state argued that "regardless of how you feel about wanting to provide concentrated services, it's up to the district to give that kind

service for every youngster. They [the state] also wondered that if the school district supported 20 social workers, for example, and Title I picked up 5 social workers, that the Board [of Education] might drop theirs to 15, thus clearly using the Title I social workers to supplant the Board [local budget] personnel." (It is unclear whether this situation ever happened; but it is clear that the state believed that it might occur.) Moreover, "an audit of the Board's funded services in these areas showed that the Board funded personnel were unable to serve all children who needed health and guidance and psychology services," thus increasing the suspicion that Title I personnel were supplanting local programs.

D. 1976-77

This year the community service program continues to operate as it did the year before, accounting for 1 percent of the total Title I budget. Summer programs are also planned in health, guidance and psychology, and attendance counseling. However, there are no efforts planned to gain additional funds for other supportive service programs during the regular school year.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

A. Health services

Health services supported by Title I funds were offered as a supplement to the health services available to the general school population. In 1973-74 and 1974-75, these services were available to those Title I students in greatest need of such services. During these years the portion of the budget for supportive services spent on the health program was approximately one-third. Since 1975-76 Title I health services have been offered only during the summer.

The Title I health program offered a wide range of services, including medical and dental screening, immunizations and other preventive procedures, some actual treatment, and referrals to agencies or private physicians for those children who needed additional care. The personnel offering these services included dentists, nurses, dental assistants, medical inspectors and medical technicians--all of whom operated out of the centralized services office. In 1974-75 there were 25 full-time personnel in the health program.

Children were referred to Title I health personnel in several ways: by locally funded personnel, if, as a result of their routine screening, a Title I child was determined to need concentrated services; by locally funded personnel if they got bogged down in caseloads and weren't able to deal with a Title I child's needs quickly; or by teachers or parents. The 1974-75 Evaluation Report explained that these services were developed to provide "the identification and proper diagnosis of health deficiencies followed by referral and treatment to remedy [the] problems" of Title I children "on a priority basis." As has been discussed, the district was unable to demonstrate that this policy was not in practice a supplanting of the regular health program.

B. Guidance and Psychological Services

Guidance and psychological services, like health services, were offered as a supplement to similar services provided by local funds to the entire school population. The guidance and psychological services were based at the centralized office until the end of the 1974-75 school year. Since then such services funded under Title I have been offered only during the summer. In 1973-74 the budget for these services was slightly more than one-half of the total Title I budget allocated for supportive services; in 1974-75 it was slightly less than one-half.

Guidance and psychological services were provided to Title I children under programs at a guidance center and at a local youth clinic.

In 1974-75 personnel offering Title I services at the guidance center included 11 professionally trained social workers, 2 of whom were bilingual; and 2 psychologists. Services at the guidance center focused on the detection and diagnosis of social, emotional, and speech problems. The staff psychologists diagnosed such problems, and the social workers offered treatment through parent-child conferences or home visitation, or referred children to agencies outside the school for treatment. Social workers also offered consultative services to Title I school principals and staff, as well as the local Parent Councils.

In addition to the services provided by the guidance center, psychiatric services were available to Title I children through the youth clinic, which was contracted to supply psychiatric outpatient service for Title I children. If necessary, services were also provided to the parents of these children. Referrals were made to the clinic by the centralized services office. The services offered by the clinic began with diagnosis of a child's emotional and environmental needs by a team composed of a psychiatrist, social worker and psychologist. Depending on the results of this diagnosis, children received treatment which might include home visitation, and individual or group therapy. In 1974-75 the center agreed to maintain at all times a case load of at least 110 students.

(The respondent did not break the health and guidance and psychological services into such clear areas. He classified the services offered by the youth clinic under health, and classified the services offered by the guidance center as both social work services and guidance and

psychological services. However, in the 1974-75 Evaluation Report these three areas--health, youth development and child guidance--were listed as separate programs, and they have been treated as such here.)

C. Community Services (parent involvement)

Community services have not only continued to be provided by Title I funds throughout the four year study period, but they have increased significantly during this period.

In 1973-74 the community service program was very limited, amounting to less than 2 percent of the Title I budget for supportive services during that year. The $11,000 spent for community services supported workshops on topics of interest to Title I parents and a city-wide Title I parents conference.

In 1974-75 the scope of the community service program was dramatically increased. Its allocated funds amounted to 16 percent of the total Title I budget for supportive services. Since the curtailment of other supportive service programs at the end of 1974-75, the community service program has constituted 100 percent of the Title I budget for supportive services offered during the regular school year. This increase in the program was brought about "by changes in the Title I guidelines which required [instead of recommended] the input of parents into Title I planning. The success of the program in involving parents has kept it going."

Since 1974-75 the community service program has provided in-service training programs for parents who are elected to serve on the Parents Advisory Councils; sponsored workshops on issues of concern to Title I parents; provided parents reimbursement for car fare and per diem

expenses incurred in the course of PAC duties; sponsored an annual Title I parent conference; and paid the expenses of PAC representatives to state and national Title I conferences. The community service program is administered by a Co-ordinator for Parent Activities, who serves as a resource person for the PAC's in regard to federal and state guidelines and legislation; arranges and conducts training programs, workshops, and conferences; and serves as the liaison between a staff of part-time Community Consultants and the PAC's they serve. An Assistant Co-ordinator was added this year to the full-time staff.

There are approximately 20 part-time Community Consultants who observe and assist PAC activities and serve as community contact persons between the Board of Education, the PAC and the Title I parents. One of their functions is to assist in the evaluation survey conducted each spring by helping parents who are participating in the survey complete the questionnaire. Since Community Consultants are a part of the community they serve, a "parent to parent relationship" exists between them and Title I parents, who "are more open-minded with someone who is their peer."

In 1975-76 over 500 parents participated in the parent training sessions. Workshops were also held on topics such as federal and state Title I guidelines, child growth and development, health services, nutrition, and drug education.

D. Attendance Counseling

During the school years 1973-74 and 1974-75 a limited amount of Title I funds was appropriated for an attendance counseling program. This program was curtailed at the end of the 1974-75 school year.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING

A. Goals

The goals of the health and guidance and psychology components of the Title I supportive service program were to provide concentrated services in these areas to Title I children over and above those services made available by the locally funded program. The district considered its locally funded programs insufficient for meeting the needs of the entire student body, much less to provide the kind of intensive service that Title I children needed: "We found that the Title I youngsters were not getting services provided by the Board [local budget] program when they really needed it, so we decided that if we could have more supportive service staff, then the Board-funded nurse or social worker could turn a Title I case which they couldn't treat immediately to one of the Title I nurses or social workers who could then come in and provide immediate treatment. Since we were working with youngsters [in the Title I program] who were the most in need of such services, it had to be a concentrated, speedy effort of this kind. When they need something, they need it right away. We couldn't afford to wait around until one of the Board-sponsored supportive service personnel had a chance to treat the child."

The goals of the community service program were directed toward facilitating meaningful involvement of Title I parents in the planning and evaluation of the district's Title I program. These goals are met by workshops and conferences designed to inform and educate parents about Title I guidelines and regulations, and the community organizing services performed by the paraprofessional staff. "We feel the more information we

give to parents, the better we and they are able to work together. Giving parents the same vocabulary and background that administrators have makes for better relationships between those groups because with the parents' understanding of the regulations and guidelines, they are better equipped to describe needs and plan programs for meeting them."

B. Decision-making process

The decision-making mechanism for planning the district's Title I supportive programs is centralized in the office of the Superintendent. The Superintendent and his staff have a series of meetings with people at all levels of the planning process--the PAC and Title I school principals and staff--who give their recommendations to the central staff. "Based on these recommendations and what we have done in the past and on the results of the annual evaluation [see below] of the program, we set priorities and plan the next year's program." The final decisions of the Superintendent are based on the work done by various sub-committees on tasks such as preparing the application, and on aspects of the program such as summer programs and parent involvement. "There are committees that work together, which cover the range of people involved in this process from the Superintendent right on down. Title I parents and staff have an important input, but their input is chiefly made through the evaluation questionnaires. However, the final power and actual weight of decisions lies with the Superintendent and his staff, because though we get a lot of ideas from parents and staff, some of them are so far out that they would never be approved by the Board [of Education]. For instance, it was recommended that personnel be assigned to act as chauffers for the parents, but it was out of the question to have a line item in the budget to provide such a service. I would say the final decision regarding Title I programs lies with the Superintendent, subject to Board approval, of course."

During planning the Title I Program Administrator acts as a "liaison between the Title I staff and the parents and the Superintendent. My office is like a media center. I gather recommendations from these groups and report them to the Superintendent's office." (The principals report directly to the Superintendent.)

The process of setting priorities and allocating funds for various programs is chiefly a matter of working from precedent, unless some intervening factor such as a negative evaluation or a change in guidelines requires complete replanning. "We don't reinvent the wheel each year. We work from last year's budget. We look at what we had last year, how much money we have this year, and we usually keep things in line. If there are any changes made, we require there to be supporting data from the evaluation process to merit such changes." In short the likelihood of a major change in Title I programs is slim. "Once a program is set up, it continues to exist." Major changes, such as the loss of the health, the guidance and psychology, and the attendance counseling programs during the regular school year and the beefing up of the community service program, come about as the result of changes in guidelines and policies initiated at the federal or state level.

C. Needs assessment and evaluation

Needs assessments and evaluation for the instructional components of the Title I program involve regular student testing as well as the annual evaluation. However, for the supportive service program the annual evaluation provided the primary focus for needs assessment and evaluation. During the four year study period the district has employed a private research organization to conduct the formal evaluation of the Title I program.

This evaluation consist chiefly of questionnaires distributed to a random sample of Title I students and their parents, Title I staff, regular teaching staff, and administrators. Parents are involved in the wording of the questionnaires so that they are "not offended or put on the defensive by language or concepts that are unfamiliar or unclear." Community consultants who work with the community service program assist in the administration of the questionnaires to parents. These questionnaires survey the types of services Title I children have received, the adequacy of those services, and the kinds of services they need but have not received. The community service program has been evaluated largely on the basis of the numbers of parents participating in PAC workshops and conferences and the parents' assessment of the worth of these programs. On the basis of the completed questionnaires and the analysis provided by the research organization, the district is able to assess the effectiveness of the Title I supportive service programs.

In addition to the survey, the needs assessment and the evaluation for the health and the guidance and psychology programs offered in 1973-74 and 1974-75 also relied upon statistics which showed the number of children receiving such services on a monthly basis.

On the basis of his informal evaluation, the respondent felt that the health and the guidance and psychology programs were indeed providing needed services to Title I children. "The health needs and emotional problems of these children were met and were referred for correction, but I really don't know if their health and emotional status improved as a result of the program." He believed that the community service program had succeeded in meeting the goal of effecting meaningful involvement of

parents in Title I activities. "Overall, the program has made the PAC's an effective pressure group that regularly attends Board [of Education] meetings, speaks articulately on the issues, and asks questions that a person working in the school system would never dream of asking."

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS, AND FUTURE PLANS

The district's experience with its Title I supportive service programs between 1973 and 1977 has been mixed. Under the pressure of federal guidelines the district has instituted a successful community service program which has facilitated the participation of parents in Title I planning and evaluation. On the other hand it has had to discontinue all other supportive services (health, guidance and psychology, attendance counseling) because it was unable to demonstrate to the state that these Title-I funded services were not supplanting locally funded programs in the same areas. Since 1975-76 supportive services other than the community service program are now offered only during the summer when locally funded programs are not in operation and there is no possibility of supplanting. As a result, "fewer students altogether are now getting served, because in addition to the loss of the Title I programs, the Board programs have also been cut back. We've cut supportive service staff much more heavily that instructional staff in adjusting to general reductions in the budget." Though there are city agencies that offer both health and guidance and psychology services,

> it's an expense to the parent to take their children there, and we felt that by providing these services in the schools that it was the least expensive way of doing it in the long run. We tried to fix it so that the parent would not be inconvenienced. We found that parents know their youngsters might need guidance

services, for instance, but they are reluctant to take them to an agency for such services because of time or money problems. So if you have such services in the school and the youngster is there, the service is much more likely to be delivered.

The community service program has not had such problems with cutbacks, but rather has increased in scope as a result of a change in policy which made the district feel that it had to beef up its effort to involve parents in Title I activities. One measure of the success of this program has been the problems it has caused.

The more effective voice that the parents now have has caused some problems with the Board. Some of their recommendations have been too far out and this has resulted in opposition from the administration. And since it's my job to be the liaison between the parents and the administration, I usually have to justify their recommendations. In some cases when programs are being held up by the administration, parents have come in to complain and have jarred the funds loose. It puts me in a precarious situation, of course, when such conflicts erupt. But having this community service program has avoided really antagonistic situations from outside groups because our community service program keeps the community informed and sets up the mechanism for community involvement. With a good community service program we have support for what's right. We really couldn't have an effective Title I program unless the parents are involved. And it is unlikely that if we were to lose Title I funds for this program that the Board would be willing to fund it. They already ask why we need to spend so much money on training parents. They wonder if they can't just be trained once, but of course there is a continual overturn in the parents who take part.

ESEA Title I Compensatory Education
Support Services
Case Study # 15

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74

B. 1974-75

C. 1975-76

D. 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

A. Library/Resource Center

B. Community Services

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

B. Decision-Making Process

C. Needs Assessment and Evaluation

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS, PLANS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

This district is part of an urban community which lies just outside a large metropolitan center. At one time the community was largely populated by upper-middle class families who commuted into the city for work. In recent years, however, many of the wealthier families have left and have been replaced by working class families attracted by the low rents in the community. A high percentage of these new families are of Spanish descent.

The district consists of ten public schools and one non-public school. On the basis of the annual AFDC count, the five public schools with the highest percentage of disadvantaged children are targeted as Title I schools. Only five schools can qualify for Title I each year according to the district's mandate that no more than one-half of the public schools may participate in the Title I program, even if more than one-half of the schools have a percentage of AFDC children higher than the district average. This policy is intended to assure concentration of Title I services in the schools with the most need. While the number of Title I public schools is always five, the particular schools chosen have changed from year to year. During this period the one private school has also been targeted for Title I services.

Title I instruction is centrally located in one school which houses the Title I Learning Center. The Title I children are bused to the center two afternoons a week for instruction. Until two years ago, Title I instruction was offered only to children in pre-kindergarten through the third grade, but two years ago the range was extended to the fourth grade. The

Title I pre-kintergarten program is the only pre-kintergarten program in the district and most of the Title I program's overall growth has been at this level.

The close working relationships between the director, the Title I staff, teachers, students and parents is a particularly notable aspect of the Title I program. A series of informal networks links these various persons, and the director works very hard to create new links, while maintaining a low profile on bureaucracy. Several factors contribute to the close-working relationship found in the program. One of these is the program's small size. Although the program has grown from 90 to 150 students over the past four years, it is still relatively small, and the director and the Title I teachers know all of the students and their parents by name. The physical layout of the program also contributes to the close working relationship. Since the Title I administrative office is located side by side with the Title I classrooms in the Title I Learning Center, there is a constant exchange of information and ideas between the director and the Title I teachers. Parents are also involved in this exchange. They have an open invitation to visit the library/resource center, located in a small room off the administrative office.

The Title I director views the entire Title I program as one integrated system of instruction and supportive services under which everyone does a little bit of everything, whether it be instruction or supportive services. As expressed by the Title I director, "We are not organizationally pigeon-holed." While the Title I instructional program focuses on reading, language development, and math, the supportive services program provides community services and a library/resource center. Except for the Title

I director, all of the other Title I teachers and staff are part-time. The full-time director divides her time and salary evenly between running the overall Title I program and directing its community service component.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74

The Title I library/resource center and the community service program have been in continuous operation in the district since the Title I program was begun in 1971. The library/resource center was begun when the present director, who assumed her duties that year, brought her personal library of child development and other related books to the Title I office for the use of both Title I and non-Title I staff. The staff liked the idea, and soon other people began donating their books. At that time the director did not realize that Title I funds were available for materials for Title I libraries.

Parents were also invited to use the books in hopes that this invitation might attract more parents to the school. After two years, however, when it became clear that most parents were not interested in academic books, the director changed the focus of the library/resource center from "trying to educate the parents to trying to inform them." To serve these ends the book selection was broadened to include works on current topics and fiction and non-fiction classics.

The Title I director also functions as the community services resource person. Since the program began in 1971 the direction and focus of the community services program has changed very little. It is primarily directed toward increasing parent participation through the use of the PAC and parent workshops. During PAC meetings and parent workshops, community service funds were used to pay babysitters and provide transportation, if necessary.

During the 1973-74 school year most of the parent workshops were planned and run by the Title I director and the Title I teachers. The topics for the workshops were chosen by the Title I staff.

Besides parent involvement, community services were aimed at identifying any Title I children with special physical, social, or emotional problems preventing them from achieving their potential. The Title I staff, especially the director, acted as ombudsmen, bringing the problem to the parent's attention, providing parents with referrals to the proper persons for correcting the problem, and, if necessary providing transportation to the proper agency.

During the 1973-74 school year the Title I program also hired a psychologist, on a part-time basis, to administer standardized tests to the Title I children for the purpose of recording their development.

B. 1974-75

During this year the library/resource center and the community service program continued in operation. However, the part-time psychologist left the program in mid-year for personal reasons and it was decided not to replace her. "We realized that we could do the testing ourselves."

The library/resource center remained essentially the same; though a small appropriation was given to the library for purchasing books, most books acquired at the library still came from personal donations.

The community services program maintained its ombudsman role and its emphasis on facilitating parent participation. New ideas were constantly being experimented with. During this year, for instance, parents and siblings of Title I students were invited to accompany the Title I students on field trips. During the summer program the Title I staff and parents donated

food and prepared a breakfast for the students and their parents. The breakfast provided a time for causual conversation and a convenient avenue for the exchange of information.

One of the major undertakings of 1974-75 was a movie about the Title I program, which was made by one of the Title I teachers in connection with the facilities at a local museum. It was narrated by one of the Title I students and depicted many of the Title I activities. The film, which was shown to the Title I parents and later to civic and community groups, became a source of great local pride.

C. 1975-76

As in the preceding year, the library/resource center and the community service program were part of the Title I program in the district. The community service program was unchanged from the preceding year, but a new aspect was added to the library/media center.

In this state the unused Title I monies are collected from the various districts and pooled into a general fund. Districts may then submit proposals for additional funding for new or innovative ideas. During the 1975-76 school year this district was awarded some of these additional funds for a "toy-lending" library. The idea was implemented under the community services umbrella and handled through the library/resource center.

Educational toys for the program were purchased by the director, assembled into kits, and placed in the toy-lending library from which, like books, they could be borrowed by the Title I students or their parents. The toy-lending program was intended to enrich the home environment of Title I children and to serve as a further way of attracting parents to the school and increasing their exposure to the Title I program. The idea caught on quickly and has become a large success. Except for this

new toy-lending service, the library/resource center operated this year much as it had the year before.

D. 1976-77

This year both the library/resource center and the community service program continue in operation. The library/resource center is unchanged from last year, and the district has applied for another grant to expand the toy-lending library. This year, to meet what the director recognized as a particular lack of adult education classes in the community, the community service program expanded its parent workshops. Instead of relying on Title I staff to give presentations, the district has secured additional funds to hire knowledgeable persons for the workshop presentations. In addition, funds have been used to send members of the Title I staff to various training sessions relating to workshop topics so the staff could do the presenting in a more complete and informative manner. For example, a three-day workshop on divorce was recently attended by the Title I director and one of the Title I teachers before a parent workshop on the same subject was held. The response from the Title I parents to the increased workshop program has been very favorable, and the parent workshops have been well attended. Beyond this one change, the community services program ran much as it did in previous years.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICES

A. Library/Resource Center

Although the district views the library/resource center as part of its community services effort and allocates funds for the center from its community services budget, for reasons of clarity the two are considered separately in this report.

The library is located in the Title I Learning Center, in a room adjoining the Title I administrative office. All book acquisitions and donations are handled through the Title I director as part of her community service responsibilities. The director also supervises the library operations. Access to the library is informal and books may be checked out from either the secretary or the Title I director. The library is open to all Title I personnel, the regular teaching staff and the Title I parents. As mentioned previously, the toy kits which are handled through the library may be checked out by either a Title I parent or a Title I student.

For the professional persons using the library there are works on new research in education, various curriculum areas, the special needs of children, other successful programs, principles of education and child development, and materials on guidance and testing. For the parents there are books on current events and popular and classical works of fiction and non-fiction. Of course parents are not restricted to these books and may check out any work that interests them.

Since the library's beginning, private book donations have been the main source of new books. Accordingly, the funds appropriated to the library have increased only slightly in the four year period under investigation. While the library is seen as an important element in the community services program, it is not one of the highest priorities and it is unlikely that it will receive a substantial increase in funding in coming years.

B. Community Services

The Title I program in this district includes the full-time director, five part-time teachers, one part-time secretary and several part-time aides. According to the director, "Everyone is involved in community services," although the program's direction and supervision comes from

the Title I director. The Title I director receives one-half of her salary for her responsibilities in the community services program. The Title I teachers may devote one-fifth of their time to community service activities and are paid for this time out of the community service budget. In one sense this is representative of the high importance which the director places on community services. As she stated, "I could cross out community services and hire another teacher--and we need more teachers--but that would be a net loss to the program."

All of the students receiving Title I instruction (with their parents) are eligible for the community services support and all receive it. Most of the activities under this program relate to increasing parent participation in the program. One aspect of the program involves keeping the parents informed through the PAC meeting and the parent workshops. With the assistance of Title I parents, these meetings and workshops are organized and run by the Title I director and the Title I teachers. Previously Title I staff conducted those workshops, but this year funds have been made available to hire outside persons to present the parent workshops.

Telephone contact with Title I parents is viewed as a very important part of the community services program. Routine calls to parents to remind them of PAC meetings and parent workshops provide the director an opportunity to discuss other matters and to become acquainted with the parents. During these calls the Title I director will discuss any special problems that a child might be having. If she discovers that the parent needs help in dealing with the situation, the Title I director will put the parent in touch with the proper persons. If she discovers that the parents need transportation she or a member of the staff will often provide it. The

part-time secretary also assists in making these calls. Babysitting and transportation services may also be provided by Title I funds in order to facilitate participation in PAC meetings and workshops.

A range of other activities is carried out to increase parental involvement. Title I parents and siblings of Title I students may accompany the Title I students on field trips. Parents are encouraged to visit the classrooms and library whenever it is convenient to them. Parents are also involved in special events during the holidays. The program runs an annual pot-luck Christmas dinner, for which the staff and Title I parents supply the food. (Title I funds may provide some of the beverages or some food as a back-up in case of over-flow crowds.) These combined activities have been so successful that over 50 percent of all the Title I parents contribute to organizing and preparing the community service activities, and nearly 100 percent participate in one activity or another during the year.

Consistent with the whole approach to community services is the informal and personal contact which is built into the network. "Someone only has to ask and we try our best to provide them or connect them with the services they need."

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The Title I supportive service program has several goals. The first goal is to create a link for the parents between the community and the school. Through this ombudsman role it is hoped that:

1. increased cooperation between the home and school will enhance each child's motivation and ability to learn.
2. the Title I staff will be able to assist parents in securing assistance with any specific problems that impede a child's performance.

A second goal is to increase parent participation in the Title I program. With increased participation it is felt that:

1. parents will become more familiar with the goals and intent of the Title I program.

2. parents will better be able to understand the needs of their children and how they may contribute to the learning process.

3. the parent workshops and access to the library will stimulate new interests for the parents besides informing them on topics relevant to their current interests.

B. Decision-Making Process

Based on the results of the evaluation of the program (see below), the Title I Director plans the program for the following year. The comments of the teaching staff are a very important part of her consideration of plans for the coming year. "Quite sincerely, if someone has a good idea we do all we can to work it out." Final decisions regarding the program rest solely with the Title I director.

General priorities favor the academic component of the program over the supportive service adjunct. For special projects, like the movie which was made two years ago, Title I funding for supportive services will be increased; generally,however, increases in supportive service funding are sought from the general fund awards for innovative ideas. The director feels so strongly about the benefits of the community services effort that if supportive services were dropped from Title I she would find some other ways to include them in the budget. Whether it were supported financially or not, she feels the outreach efforts by herself and the staff would continue. As it is now, "There is a considerable amount of intangible and unpaid community outreach going on all the time."

C. Evaluation and Needs Assessment

In order to evaluate how successfully the supportive service component is achieving its goals, two evaluations are held each year: a formal evalua-

tion at the end of the school year and a less formal mid-year evaluation. For the mid-year evaluation, the district sends a form to all of the Title I parents, asking for their comments and thoughts on the Title I program. If, after a reasonable length of time, a parent has not returned the form, one of the Title I staff members will call the home.

For the more extensive end-of-the-year evaluation no formal meetings are held. "We are in constant contact with all of the people involved with the children. Because it is a small town and a small school system there is no need to formalize; if everything is too structured the input begins to lose meaning." To begin this process the Title I director meets informally with each of the Title I teachers to hear his or her view of the program's accomplishments and shortcomings. Each teacher is encouraged to suggest changes or improvements. Principals, especially from the Title I schools, are encouraged to give input. There are no special meetings with the principals and any input they provide is voluntary.

In addition, the parents are sent a somewhat lengthy questionnaire. They are asked questions such as how they think their child benefited from the program, how or if they felt they had personally benefited from the program, what they liked best and least about the program, what criticisms they have or what changes they would like to see.

Typical responses to the question, "What do you like about the program," asked in last year's evaluation included:

"The fact that the teachers take an interest in each child"
"The toy library was the best idea ever"
"I like that parents are able to help in class and find out what the child does and how he gets along with people."
"Being able to work with the children as much as I can"

or

"I think the whole program is wonderful."

Again, parents who are slow to return their questionnaires receive a follow-up phone call from the Title I staff. The completion rate is close to 100 percent.

V. SUMMARY

In describing the district's Title I program, the director stated, "We started out with all burners at once. It really blows people's minds to see what we do here." Through the activities supported under community services the Title I staff has worked very hard to inform and involve parents in the program. As a result, "We have a reputation now of being very close to families." This closeness between the director, staff, parents and Title I students is one of the outstanding qualities of the program.

When asked what she would like to see done in the future, the director responded, "I would like to have a comfortable space where parents could come in and sit. I would also like to have a lot more parent workshops. The parents really love having people come in and give talks for them. I would definitely like to see a lot more of that." In terms of the supportive services which the district now offers, the director stated, "We do rather well with what we have."

There are no plans to expand supportive services in such areas as health, guidance, or social work. According to the director the school has a "highly developed" system of supportive services. "There is a counselor in every school and the schools provide us with dental, hearing and visual specialists who come in and test the children." The state also has a law which requires that any child with a problem which impedes his or her ability to learn must be provided with the proper assistance. Given these supports on the local school level, the director feels that the Title I children are very adequately cared for. "If there is a problem we have only the

need to point it out to them. If we feel we need more guidance counselors, we have but to make a case for it and they [the school system] will provide." Consequently, the director feels it "would only be confusing to hire our own specialists."

Although the Title I enrollment has increased from 90 to 150 students, over the past four years it still remains a small program. Since the program's beginning, community services have been the main thrust of the supportive service adjunct. A library resource center, funded under community services, has also been with the program since it began. The district is continually experimenting with new and innovative ideas for expanding out-reach to parents, which it sees as a critical component in the development of an effective Title I program. Through this out-reach the district is also able to expand its role as an ombudsman between the school and the community. Although the director assumes the primary responsibility for community services, the entire Title I staff is involved in the program. The teachers, however, must keep the director informed of all of their efforts in this area.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 16

Outline

I. Introduction and District Characteristics

II. Historical Perspective

III. Determination of Need and Eligibility

IV. Non-Title I Supportive Services

V. Decisions Concerning Title I Supportive Services

VI. Future of Title I Supportive Services

VII. Conclusions

I. Introduction and District Characteristics

This district is located in a somewhat rural, suburban area with a population of 12,000. There are no major local industries, and most of the residents commute to one of two larger nearby cities for employment. There are seven public schools and one non-public school in the district. The public schools include one high school (600 students), one middle school (1,000 students) and five elementary schools (1400 students). The elementary schools house grades one through four, the middle includes grades five through eight, and the high school has the remaining grades of nine through twelve. There are no minority or ethnic groups represented in the school-age population.

Currently, the Title I program exists in four of the public elementary schools, in the one middle school, and in the non-public school. Instruction in reading and kindergarten readiness is provided from Title I funds to qualifying students in kindergarten through the fifth grade. The staff includes five reading teachers, one kindergarten readiness teacher, and one full-time aide. No supportive services are provided or ever have been provided through the district's Title I program.

II. Historical Perspective

The district has been involved in the Title I program since its inception in 1965, but prior to the 1974-75 school year the district only offered a summer program. Summer instruction between 1965 and 1974 was given in physical education, transition first grade, reading pre-school, and special needs. In recent years, however, there has been a push from

the state to de-emphasize summer programs in favor of Title I regular school year programs

As a result of the state's recommendation, the school superintendent appraised the school system's remedial reading program. In his estimation, the remedial reading instruction that the students were receiving on a once or twice a week basis was not sufficient to meet their needs. He felt that with the assistance of Title I funds a supplementary reading program, which met on a daily basis, could be instituted. Consequently, he appointed one of the local school principals as the new Title I director in January of 1975, and gave him the task of putting together a regular school year Title I program.

The program began two months later with Title I instruction in reading and kindergarten readiness. Given the enormous task of putting together a program in such a short space of time, only one school was in the program in 1975. The original Title I enrollment included eighty students. Participants for the Title I reading program had been selected on the basis of standardized reading test scores, the students with the lowest scores being chosen for the program. The Title I director was not familiar with the criteria which had been used to select children for the kindergarten readiness program.

With the advent of the regular school year program, it was the Title I director's decision to drop the summer program after it ran its course during the summer of 1975. In his words:

> Unless you have a lot of money to play with, they (the state Title I officials) want you to spend at least 85 percent of your budget on winter programs. In our case that doesn't leave enough to run a summer program.

During the next school year, 1975-76, the Title I regular school year program began in earnest. It had an operating budget of $37,000, plus some additional carry-over money. The number of participating schools had increased from one to three and the student enrollment had doubled. The program remained the same, with instruction being given in reading and kindergarten readiness.

While there has been substantial growth in this year's Title I program, the program has not changed in content or focus from the previous year. The number of participating Title I schools has grown to six with 225 students enrolled in the program. The Title I budget is $75,000 with still some carry-over funds from the previous year. Due to the substantial increase in the budget, the Title I director has been able to double his Title I staff to its current size of seven.

Looking at the program's development over the past 2½ years it can be seen that the student enrollment has increased three-fold. When asked if this represented any change in the population base, the Title I director said "No." As he expressed it, "There has always been a great need for it [Title I]. The kids were always there but we never utilized it. I guess we weren't channelling our monies as well as we should."

III. Determination of Need and Eligibility

The eligibility of schools for the Title I program is determined by the use of an AFDC count, those schools with the highest concentrations being accepted into the program. Once a school has been designated a Title I school, all of the children in that school are theoretically eligible for Title I services, according to the director. To select targeted or "Title I serviceable" students from among all of those who

are eligible, an assessment of individual needs is completed for each of the students. The needs assessment involves the use of two criteria, the student's score on a standardized reading test and teacher recommendations. The children primarily chosen are those who score below the 40th percentile, although in a few exceptional cases, a child who scores slightly higher can be selected if there are strong teacher recommendations to that effect.

The Title I director describes Title I children as students of generally average intelligence whose lack of performance in school is frequently attributable to factors of maturity. It is the goal of the program to bring these children who, in most cases, are one to two years behind their grade level in reading, up to par within three or four years. For this reason there may be some children with more severe deficiencies who are excluded from the Title I program. In these instances the children are generally diagnosed as having more severe problems which require other special services.

IV. Non-Title I Supportive Services

Four types of supportive services are currently being provided through the local school system. Services in counseling and health are locally funded. The health program supports three school nurses; one in the high school, one in the middle school and one nurse for the remaining five elementary schools. School nurses have a variety of duties, ranging from maintaining individual health records on each one of the children to making home visits for the purpose of discussing with the parents the persistent or specific health problems of their children. Home visits are also made if there is evidence of child neglect or abuse. In addition,

the nurses handle the routine emergencies which occur at school and conduct any screening or testing, such as for hearing or vision.

The school system offers two types of guidance counseling. Routine academic or personal problems are handled by seven guidance counselors who are allocated among the seven public schools in the district. Two are situated in the high school and the other five work in the middle school and the five elementary schools. The other type of counseling service is provided by a school psychologist who works with more difficult student problems and, when necessary, counsels parents.

The one federally supported service is the lunch program, funded by the National Lunch Program. The state has also mandated a school breakfast program for the next year, but this district has chosen not to participate. The School Board made this decision on the basis of their assessment of limited need and the cost to the district of $50,000 in matching funds. According to the Title I director, who is himself a school principal, the school principals in the district support the action. Commenting on the decision, the Title I director remarked:

> I'm not an anti-welfare person. I think there is a duty to feed children who are on welfare but I also think there are some duties of parents. I even think there are too many persons in the free lunch program.

The fourth type of supportive service is mandated by a state law which specifies that all children found to have special needs must be provided the necessary services primarily from local funds. In compliance with the law, each district must have an evaluation team comprised of a coordinator of special needs, school psychologist, guidance counselors, school nurses, principals, classroom teachers and others. The process begins when a child is referred to the school principal, usually by a

classroom teacher or parent. If the principal approves the referral, the case is presented to the coordinator of special needs, who makes an evaluation and decides in what areas the child needs special testing. Once the testing is completed, the entire evaluation team meets for a pre-evaluation session, where the testing results are reviewed and discussed. Following this action the evaluation team meets again with the parent; the results are reviewed once more; and a future course of action is planned. Three months later the case is re-evaluated in order to assess the effectiveness of the action.

Under this system any child who has a medical, social, or psychological problem which reaches beyond the scope of the system's routine supportive services will receive special help. However, the Title I director estimates that 99 percent of the cases coming before the evaluation team thus far have related to problems of an academic nature.

V. Decisions Concerning Title I Supportive Services

Since the beginning of the Title I regular school year program in the latter half of the 1975-76 school year, the question of Title I supportive services has been raised only once. At the program's initiation in January of 1975, the school superintendent approached the new Title I director with the idea of applying for a Title I nurse. Then, as now, the district only had three school nurses: two nurses served 1600 students (the combined number of high school and middle school students) and one nurse served the remaining 1400 elementary students. "With only one nurse for all of the elementary schools, the children aren't getting the services they need."

Using these statistics to establish the need for a Title I nurse, the director requested Title I funds for a health program, but his request was turned down. As he described it, "Technically, I could justify the nurse and they [the Title I state officials] said I needed one but they said that it was a district problem and not a Title I problem. I guess I was green and naive at that time." The problem was basically one of supplanting. The district planned to divide the elementary school population between the regular school and the Title I nurse, which would have meant that the Title I nurse would be involved in routine medical duties as opposed to those of a supplementary nature as defined by Title I. The Title I director has not entertained the thought of reapplying for Title I supportive services. He feels that he cannot avoid the supplanting problem and that the issue of supportive services is really a district problem.

Nor does the director currently plan to apply for Title I funds for additional supportive services. He identified no need to increase expenditures for the existing free and reduced lunch program. On counseling programs he expressed two slightly varying opinions. On the one hand he felt that the students were receiving the attention they needed: "Every school is covered; I don't think there is a pressing need [for additional counselors]." On the other hand, when asked if he thought Title I children had problems which require extensive counseling, he replied:

> That's a good question and I don't know how to answer that. If I had to venture a guess I would say 'yes, they do.' I think there are often underlying reasons why kids fail in school. I guess we could always use more guidance counselors.

VI. Future of Title I Supportive Services

In order to rectify the shortage of school nurses for children in the elementary grades, there is a request in the next year's local school budget for an additional nurse. However, the Title I director is not optimistic about its approval:

> This town is like towns all over, they don't want to spend the extra money. We have a money problem, there is no industry in this town and there never will be. They're having budget problems, especially since they're opening a new school next year.

If the additional nurse is approved, the director feels he would be in a much better position to request a Title I nurse in the future since the supplanting problem would be lessened as it would be practicable for the nurse to work exclusively with Title I children. Although he feels that a Title I nurse could be justified in addition to the two local budget nurses, he feels it would be unlikely that he would make the request.

The director differentiated the need for supportive services in his district from that in large city districts, where he feels the need is more pressing. Although he acknowledged that he was not personally familiar with these types of districts, from what he had read he understood that some city schools have an overwhelming number of children from families on welfare. In such instances, he believed physical needs, like "simple hunger and clothing," could play important roles in determining how children perform in school. But he did not see such needs as playing an important role in his district:

> Sure, we have poor people and I'm not saying that we don't have individual cases with these greater needs, but with the money that we have I just can't justify them [Title I supportive services].

He explained his decision not to request Title I funds for supportive services as a matter of district priorities:

> Understand my point, I think there is a greater need for other things. I think priorities have to be looked at--if I had more money and was able to add more stuff, I wouldn't add supportive services. I would add academic staff, especially in math. That's where I think the needs are for us.

He did not believe that the Title I mandate to emphasize academic instruction over supportive services was influencing his decision:"No, it's really my decision." As Title I director he is solely responsible for the content, focus, planning and functioning of the Title I program. The director makes all of the decisions regarding the Title I program. Few parents or persons within the school system come to him with suggestions or feedback about the program. He has had no pressure from parents, especially Title I parents, school principals or other persons concerning the addition of Title I supportive services.

VII. Conclusions

The absence of Title I funded supportive service programs in the district according to the Title I director, is due to the lack of need for such services and the priorities set by the district.

Except for the need for an additional nurse to work with elementary students--a need which the director considers "desperate"--, he identified no other needs for supportive service programs in the district. And he explained that even if the supplanting issue, which was the basis for the state's rejection of an earlier application for funds to support a Title I nurse, were resolved it would not be likely that he would then reapply for such funds because of more pressing needs in the instructional program.

Although the director recognized that individual cases exist where the non-instructional needs of some children are not being met, he feels that the expense of Title I supportive service programs cannot be justified. According to his priorities, he believes that additional Title I funds, were they available, could be better spent in the area of academics, especially in the development of a math program.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 17

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS OF REPORT

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74, 1974-75

B. 1975-76

C. 1976-77

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICE

A. Library/Media Center

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

B. Decision-making Process

C. Evaluation and Needs Assessment

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS, AND FUTURE PLANS

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

The district, which serves a predominantly rural area, has a student enrollment of 2,150 in the four public schools, a number which has remained relatively stable during the study period. One non-public school in the district attendance area serves an additional 200 students. (There is another non-public school, but since it refuses to cooperate with the district, enrollment figures for it are not available.) The enrollment of the district is overwhelmingly white; minority students account for less than 1 percent of the student population. The respondent described the district as one that "is sociologically five years behind the rest of the country. For example, kids here still like football. It's a very stable, middle-class community; we have less than a 10 percent turnover in the school population each year."

Title I schools are selected on the basis of free school lunch applications. In 1973-74 and 1974-75, three of the four public schools exceeded the average district enrollment of children from low income families and qualified for Title I services. As a result of a reorganization of the school system in 1975-76 and 1976-77, only two of the four public schools qualified for Title I programs. One of the private schools has qualified all four years, and, under an agreement worked out between the district and that school, 10 percent of the space in the Title I program in the public schools is reserved for non-public school children, who receive Title I services at the public schools. Currently, less than half of the students enrolled in the district are enrolled in the Title I eligible schools; prior to the reorganization of the schools in 1975-76, slightly more than

half were enrolled in Title I schools. Approximately 5 percent of the total district enrollment has taken part in Title I program during each of the four years.

During the period studied the district has offered only one supportive service, which operated in all of the qualifying Title I schools. This service was provided by a Title I library/media center, which the respondent described as a functional part of the Title I instructional program. The other part of the Title I instructional program was provided by teacher aides who assisted local budget teaching staff in regular classroom work with Title I children in the areas of reading and math.

Children served by the library/media center ranged in grade from kindergarten through grade 6; though with a reorganization of the district's schools in 1975-76, the range was changed to kindergarten through grade 5. During the operation of the library/media center priority was given to children in grades 1 and 2, as a result of priorities set by the PAC and the district staff.

The most significant change in the Title I program in the district over the past four years is the decision made in 1975-76 and implemented this year to discontinue the library/media center and to channel all Title I funds into a classroom resource teacher program in reading and math. Prior to this decision the library/media center had functioned much like a Title I classroom; Title I children were taken out of their regular classes to work with the two certified teachers who staffed the library/media centers. During the time the students were in the library/media centers, they received "instruction and remediation in reading and math" with an emphasis upon motivation. The shift to classroom resource teachers reflected a shift in program emphasis from motivation to actual instruction, and was made possible by the implementation of a learning disability program in 1975-76 which seemed to take care of most of the motivational problems previously treated

in the library/media center. Materials purchased for the library/media center are now available for use by the classroom resource teachers.

As a result of this change, the district currently has no supportive services funded by Title I. However, Title I instructional services are currently offered in the two qualifying public schools and for students in the one qualifying non-public schools. Though the respondent feels that there is a need for supportive service programs in guidance and counseling, the limited Title I funds available to the district and the priority placed by the Parents Advisory Councils and district staff on instructional programs has precluded the consideration of such services. No guidance or counseling services are available from another funding source in the district.

During the summers the district has offered no Title I programs, even though the PAC has recommended that Title I funds be used to provide a summer instructional program. However, because of limited funding and the feeling of the district staff that such summer programs should be provided by local budget funds for all students, this proposal has not been implemented.

II. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

A. 1973-74, 1974-75

During these two years the library/media center was provided from Title I funds in the four schools in the district which qualified for Title I programs, serving students from those four schools and one non-public school. The library/media center accounted for approximately two-thirds and three-eighths of the total Title I budget for these years, respectively. During those two years 66 percent and 40 percent, respectively, of the total Title I budget was spent for the library/media center. The remaining Title I funds supported a tutorial aide program in reading and math.

B. 1975-76

During this year the library/media center continued in operation; and accounted for three-eighths of the total Title I budget. Because of reorganization of the public schools in the district, these services were offered in only two public schools. Students from one of the non-public schools in the district continued to participate in the program. This year the tutorial aide instructional program was replaced by a Title I classroom resource teacher program, but the library/media center still accounted for 44 percent of the Title I allocation.

C. 1976-77

This year the library/media center is no longer in operation as a result of the district's decision to replace it with a classroom resource teacher program.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DISTRICT'S SERVICE

A. Library/Media Center

This is the only supportive service program funded under Title I which the district has provided during the four-year study period. It was operational in the district until the end of the 1975-76 school year, after which it was terminated.

From the district's point of view the library/media center was a functional part of its instructional program, providing remediation in the areas of math and reading to eligible Title I students in the four public schools which qualified for Title I in 1973-74 and 1975-76 and the two public schools which qualified in 1975-76. In each of these years there was also a participating non-public school. Under an arrangement arrived at by that school and the district, the non-public school was eligible for 10 percent of the student space in the Title I program, and sent its Title I students to the public schools for Title I services.

During the three years of its operation the services of the library/media center were provided by two certified teachers who contributed 50 percent of their time in 1973-74 and one-third of their time the other two years to the Title I program. These teachers worked with students in both upper (3-5) and lower (K-2) grade levels, but focused their services differently for the two groups. For students in the lower grades the focus was on remedial instruction in reading and math; for students in the upper grade levels the focus was more upon increasing motivation to read than upon actual instruction. The remainder of the work load for these personnel consisted of providing similar services to all students in the school. However, Title I materials were cataloged and housed separately from the materials available to the non-Title I school population.

Students were selected for participation in the Title I library/media center on the basis of three criteria: test scores, teacher referral, and referral by the school psychologist. Though all of these criteria were important, the primary focus was on a student's test scores. However, if the psychologist or classroom teacher felt that the student could profit from the kind of concentrated and individualized attention available in the library/media center, this consideration played an important role in determining which students would take part in the program.

The Title I library personnel were allocated on the basis of the Title I student population in the three participating public schools. Since the schools were close together (less than 100 feet apart), teachers and students could easily move about from school to school. With the reorganization of the schools in 1975-76, all Title I students in the two

eligible public schools were located on the same campus. The Title I library/media center was preemptory; students were first scheduled for time in the program, and then their regular class time was scheduled around the Title I time. Title I instruction usually took place in the morning.

The decision to drop the Title I library program was made at the end of the 1975-76 school year. With the implementation of a learning disability program about that time the district found that many of the children who were receiving motivational help from the Title I library/media center could be better served by the learning disability program. Since this discovery shifted the focus of the Title I library/media center entirely to remedial instruction in the lower grades, the Title I library/media center was replaced by a formal Title I classroom program where, as the respondent explains it:

> There is less emphasis on motivation and cultural enrichment, more on remediation, basic reading and math skills and phonics. So instead of focusing on self-help and encouragement programs we now concentrate on providing the Title I children with the skills and knowledge they have not had. This change was not a loss in service, rather a change in program emphasis.

The decision to drop the library/resource center was also affected by the plans of the two staff members in the program to take other positions at the end of the 1975-76 school year. Since the district has, under state law, a contractual commitment to its staff, personnel obligations are important factors in program planning. The staff members' plans to leave thus gave added impetus to the shift in program emphasis.

IV. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. Goals

The goals of the Title I library program were to provide remedial instruction in math and reading and self-help and motivational assistance to educationally and culturally deprived children in grades K-2 and 3-6, respectively.

> We found that these kids were educationally and culturally deprived, so we wanted to place them in settings where there was an imaginative teacher who worked well with media and display materials; could expose them to a wide variety of things they had not seen before; and give them exercises geared to those materials in order to help them improve their achievment level in different areas.

B. Decision-making process

The decision-making process concerning Title I programs in the district involves consultation with Title I personnel, the school adminstration, the PAC, and district officers. Actual decisions and plans are made at the district level with the advice and consent of these other groups.

The process of planning the Title I program begins with an assessment of the personnel commitments. Since state law specifies that teachers may only be dismissed for cause, personnel committments are an important consideration. Next, the evaluations of the students who have taken part in the program are considered to see if the program has achieved the effects desired. Thus, "if the program has proved successful and we have the financial resources available, then we continue on with that program."

Though the PAC does not participate in this formal process, they are given

> full knowledge of all our deliberations. We ask them to write in closed session [with no district personnel present] their recommendations, which we then review. Though we have had some difficulty

> in obtaining parent participation in Title I programs, we are more successful than other districts in this state. And unlike other districts in the state, our PAC has the opportunity to make objections to the project. There is a formal grievance procedure for them to follow if they do not agree with our decisions, though it has never been used.

The Board of Education has the final authority in this planning process:

> They must pass on the recommendations we make, but in the past years they've simply delegated to us the authority to seek these funds. So their approval has not been a formal process. We plan the program, send it to them for review, then submit the application. We do keep them informed.

C. Evaluation and needs assessment

Both establishment of the need for Title I services and the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program depend upon formal testing of students. Use of test scores is augmented by teacher referrals, the evaluation of the school psychologist, the subjective evaluations of the Title I staff, and the observations of the vice-principal in charge of each school's Title I program. PACs are also involved in this needs assessment and evaluation process. "Year after year it has always come out to one thing--reading, writing, and arithmetic."

The concentration upon standardized test scores for the needs assessment and evaluation of the Title I library/media center (which the respondent considers a part of the instructional program) was one problem he identified:

> I realize the need for comparable, uniform data, but I still don't like it. I still think that the local schools are going to have to be able to maintain the right of subjective evaluation. It's simply a disservice to place kids in neat little boxes. For instance, children might score out of the Title I program and then fall right back into it the next year because the crucial difference for them has been provided by the kind of intense, individualized instruction provided in the Title I program. And here is the value of subjective evaluations: they could show that some kids need this continuing special care and attention, even though their test scores improve, because it's that care and attention that has held them together.

V. SUMMARY: IMPRESSIONS, PROBLEMS, AND FUTURE PLANS

For the most part the district's experience with its Title I program has not been problematic, though there have been some problems adjusting to regulations and increasing parent involvement in Title I program planning and evaluation. The district would like to keep the Title I children full-time in the Title I program, but were told by the state that "this would be supplanting. So we didn't feel that by law we could go ahead and use Title I funds to provide all instruction for Title I students and use district funds to provide instruction for others, because we had gotten indications from the state that such a decision would be supplanting."

It has been difficult to get parents involved. Out of a potential 300 parents, less than 15 attend PAC meetings even though

> we have held them in both the afternoon and evenings and have sent letters home to parents to inform them of the meetings. What we plan to do now is to use the regular annual conferencing time at the beginning of the school year, which all parents participate in, as the time to get Title I parents involved in the Title I program. The PAC has recommended that we make a greater effort to get more parents involved in Title I activities, and we're working on this. For instance, we're now mailing notification of a students' participation in Title I programs before he is actually enrolled.

Except for problems with getting more parents involved and establishing more successful means of communication between the district and Title I parents, there have been few difficulties or disagreements between the district and the PAC. However, the district has taken exception to a frequent request of the PAC that a summer program be provided for Title I students. The district would like to provide summer programs for all students (none is provided at present), and does not consider it proper to focus Title I funds on this plan.

Some problems with Title I regulations, such as the supplanting issue and the disagreement with relying solely on quantitative testing, have been

mentioned above. The respondent also questioned the whole basis of the funding formula for Title I:

> One of the problems I have with the program is that since money is allocated on the basis of poverty rather than educational need, we really don't get our needs met. For instance, our Title I allocation dropped from $48,000 to $38,000 between 1972-73 and 1973-74, but the kids didn't change. The needs were still there, but the funds weren't. I was just told at a state Title I meeting how much money I would have for next year, and I will now build my program on that basis rather than on the actual needs that are in the district. I think that process is all turned around. First the needs, then the money to meet them.

Another difficulty the district experiences is a result of state law that teachers can only be dismissed for cause.

> Because of such contract obligations, we don't have a lot of flexibility. People don't leave our district; they retire here. In fact, the decision of our two Title I library personnel to take other jobs was a main reason for our making the shift in the Title I program last year. It was then or never.

But the major problems with Title I in the district seem to be philosophical. In responding to the question whether he would develop other supportive service programs in the district if the funds were available, the respondent was of two minds. In regard to a health program, he was decidedly opposed.

> If there is one in the district, it should be funded by us. We have a full time nurse on duty in the district [one for the entire district], and we have a toothbrushing program helped by the local dental society as well as health instruction. But the areas in which we need a program have to do with interpersonal and family counseling. I would like to see a three pronged program that would be directly tied to the instructional program to provide counseling services for children and their parents and to conduct home visitation to Title I parents to show them how to help their children with school work. These services could be performed by one person, a social worker or psychologist, and would cost probably $15,000. This is an idea which has been kicked around by the principals, staff, and my office; we haven't discussed it with the PAC. But we simply don't have the money for it. Our one school psychologist simply doesn't have the time to provide such services, and our efforts to send instructional materials home with children has not worked. We want to provide instructional services first in this district; that's our number one priority, but we need someone to work with parents who don't care about learning or education or don't know how to work with their kids. If we had $20,000 more dollars I could probably get this program and the summer program the PAC wants in operation.

But I have two minds about the general future of the Title I supportive service program anyway. First, I feel that before we begin to provide supportive services, we should fulfill our educational goals. I have a very definite feeling that the schools are overburdened with trying to solve all the problems of society, and because of this expectation, we have not done our job educating children, and we get criticized for it. I think we need to constrict what we expect the schools to do. They're designed to educate the child to be a good citizen--to be able to read, to write, to do higher level cognitive thinking, to be able to sort out ideas, to reconcile conflicting information. That kind of education should be top priority.

But look. We're now providing drug education, alcohol education, dealing with child abuse, providing psychological programs. Why, a mother has brought suit against the district for providing an immunization program; she argues it's not the function of the school. And I agree with her. I don't think supportive services of this kind, regardless of what the source of funds is, should be provided in the schools unless they can be shown to help directly solve a problem that interferes with the educational achievement of the student, and even then I don't like it. I don't think it's the school's responsibility to provide such services; there should be a program of this sort provided elsewhere in the community.

Of course, there's the practical reality, that if we don't deliver such services, who will? But how long can we go on performing all these duties? Right now we [the schools] are becoming baby sitters; we're like the family, and meanwhile the family institution is dying on the vine. I see a real danger for the schools coming down the pike. The public criticizes us for not doing our job educating students, and they're right. But they must also assume some of the responsibility for inflicting--I say inflicting--upon the schools some of these programs that ten years ago were assumed by the parents themselves.

And you know, Title I is a trap that's so easy to fall into. You get so dependent on it, that you can't afford to give it up. If we could, we'd do without Title I funds because we believe in education at the local level. But that kind of education has been diluted (not <u>is</u> being, it <u>has</u> been), and we can't do without Title I. We're glad to see those bucks come in; and without them we simply could not provide the services our Title I program does. But if we could, we'd do without Title I. I think we could call our own shots better.

For instance, the Title I regulations are a constant aggravation. They change from year to year; the hoops you have to jump through are extreme; and too much of my time is now taken up with just getting through all those regulations. We don't have the money to hire someone to do simply that, but we have to ask ourselves if it's worth our small program to take up so much of my time. It's not that we can't live with the regulations; it's just that they are so time consuming.

ESEA TITLE I COMPENSATORY EDUCATION
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
CASE STUDY # 18

Outline

I. INTRODUCTION AND HIGHLIGHTS

II. DESCRIPTION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

A. Title I Supportive Services

B. Non-Title I Supportive Services

III. PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

IV. SUMMARY: PLANS AND PROBLEMS

I. Introduction and Highlights

The district is located in a suburban area bordering a city of 750,000. Several large industrial firms operate plants in the area, providing both blue and white collar employment for many of the residents in the district. The district maintains 14 public schools with an enrollment of about 10,000 that has remained relatively constant throughout the four year period studied. Three non-public schools, with an enrollment of approximately 1,000 students, also operate within the district's attendance area. About five percent of the students in the district are from low-income families; about one percent are from racial or ethnic minorities.

The district's Title I program consists almost entirely of reading instruction provided by teacher aides. The eligibility of the schools that participate in the program is determined on the basis of AFDC and free lunch counts. There is no wide variance among schools in the number of economically disadvantaged students and thus, throughout the period studied, all ten of the district's elementary schools have participated in the Title I program. In selecting children to participate in the program, the district considers the poverty criteria used to select schools, academic performance, and teacher and principal judgment. For the most part, participating children are both economically and educationally disadvantaged.

When the program was begun, the reading instruction was concentrated on the lowest elementary grades; in recent years the district has been expanding the program to serve additional grades. During the current year (1976-77) Title I instruction is offered in the first through the fourth

grades and to about half of the eligible fifth and sixth grades; for the next year the district plans to extend the program to the remaining fifth and sixth grades.

The district does not allocate any Title I funds for programs in the non-public schools within the district. It does, however, provide some assistance, in the form of advice or consultations and the use of teaching materials no longer needed by the district, for the reading programs in these schools.

In the last few years the district's Title I allocation has decreased steadily by about 15 percent each year. As a result of the Orshansky formula, the district's allocation has dropped from over $120,000 in 1973-74 to about $65,000 for the current school year. During this same period, as the district has added additional grades to its reading program, the number of students participating in Title I instruction has more than doubled to over 1,000 students. The Title I funds, the bulk of which go for the salaries of the teaching aides, are thus spread quite thin. The district now uses some local funds to supplement its reading program.

II. Description of Supportive Services

A. Title I Supportive Services

The district does not presently offer, nor has it ever offered, any sizeable supportive services programs funded by Title I. In the course of the interview respondents mentioned only two items that could be considered supportive services: the purchase of Telebinoculars in 1974 for use in vision screenings, and a baby sitting service for parents attending Parent Advisory Committee meetings. The district still has

the Telebinoculars and has used them to test the vivion of new Title I students or students referred by their teachers as having possible vision problems. The screenings are performed by trained teachers or volunteers at no cost to the Title I program. Through the babysitting service the district will reimburse parents who must hire a babysitter in order to attend PAC meetings, but the service is little used. In prior years, total expenditures for the service amounted to less than $20; $40-50 is available for the service this year.

B. Non-Title I Supportive Services

From funding sources other than Title I, the district makes several health and social services available to all its students. Health services are offered, for example, through a mandated program in which the district contributes funds to a county-wide health corporation from which, in turn, it receives school health services. Through this arrangement a nurse is provided at each of the elementary schools for two or three half-days each week. The district has not found this service to be fully satisfactory, both because of the part-time nature of the service and because the nurses are not under the full control of the school district. From its own funds, the district has directly hired a full-time nurse to serve a high school that offers technical and industrial training, where a nurse's service might be needed more frequently or more urgently than at the other schools.

Seven of the district's ten elementary schools have assistant principals whose duties include guidance and counseling. Special diagnostic and evaluative testing for individual children is provided through

a special education center for exceptional children. Referrals for testing are made by principals and classrooms teachers.

Although the district does not employ any social workers as such, a number of the services often provided by social workers are provided in the district by the elementary school principals and by four attendance officers. One attendance officer serves the district high school and one serves each of three junior highs; the officer at each of the junior highs serves the elementary schools feeding students to his school. A child's attendance problem would initially be handled by the school principal; a chronic attendance problem or other problem affecting a child's development at school might be handled by the principal, the attendance officer, or, where appropriate, the school nurse, in consultation with the child's parents at school or through a home visit. In general, however, attendance problems among the Title I children in the district are not significantly greater than among non-Title I children, and the need for professional social work services does not exist at the same level as in many inner-city school districts. On occasions when it has become aware that a child or his family has a special need for clothing, food, or other assistance, the district has acted informally to meet the need through contributions from outside the school, through the PTA, or by arranging referrals to an appropriate social service agency.

III. Program Planning and Decision-Making

In planning its Title I program each year, the district consults with the district-wide Parents Advisory Committee (composed of the three or four member advisory committees from each Title I school) at a minimum of three

meetings. A first meeting is held in the fall at the beginning of the school year to report to parents the results of the evaluation of the previous year's program and to explain the components of the program being offered in the new school year. A second, initial planning meeting is held in the spring to discuss needs for the coming year--to inform parents of the district's perceptions of those needs and to gather information on the parent's perceptions--and to set tentative guidelines for the next year's program. Following this meeting, district staff proceed with detailed planning and draft a program proposal based on a tentative allocation figure supplied by state Title I officials. The proposal is then presented to the PAC at a third meeting for their review and approval. Following the PAC's review, the proposal is forwarded for review and approval by the District Superintendent and the School Board before being transmitted to the state. Throughout the planning process, state Title I officials are available for general guidance or for answers to specific questions. The state and district maintain a cooperative working relationship, but the state does not give the district specific guidelines on how to spend its Title I money.

The district sees the development of basic skills as the primary aim of its Title I program and has concentrated almost all of its Title I resources on its basic reading program. The district also sees its Title I priorities as in accord with state guidelines, which while not prohibiting supportive services (other school districts in the state do have supportive services), emphasize basic reading and math skills. With the steady reduction in its Title I funding over the last few years, moreover, there has been little opportunity for the district to consider implementing new

instructional or supportive service programs. Given the district and state priorities, it is likely that if additional Title I funds were available they would be committed by the district to its instructional programs before being considered for supportive services.

The PAC understands and concurs in the district's emphasis on reading. Neither the PAC nor other district Title I personnel have actively urged the addition of supportive services. With the limited and decreasing amount of Title I funds available to the district, the question of supportive services simply has not been seriously considered.

IV. Summary: Unmet Needs, Plans, and Problems

In response to a general question about the need for additional services that might be provided through Title I, the respondent commented on the relativity of needs and remarked to the effect that there will always be needs that, given enough money, the district might attempt to meet through additional programs. Though the need for supportive services in the district is neither so acute nor so widespread as it is in many inner-city school districts, there are needs for which the district could justify expending Title I funds. The response to a more restrictive question on the district's priorities for meeting the needs of its Title I students, however, was that the district has decided to focus its current program on the need for basic reading skills, and that, given additional funds, it would probably commit them first to full funding of its reading program, next to creating a math program, and only when these instructional programs had been funded, to supportive services. The supportive service to which the district would likely commit such funds is in the area of health, where the district might hire additional full-time nurses to provide both in-school nursing services and home visits.

The respondents did not mention having any specific problems operating with state and federal Title I guidelines. They did note that the amount of paperwork involved in obtaining a steadily decreasing Title I appropriation is becoming increasingly burdensome. Their major problem, however, is the funding itself. Each of the last three years their budget has been cut 15 percent (despite the fact that in one recent year the state reportedly returned several million unspent Title I dollars to the federal government); state mandated school programs have not been fully funded; and the state has restricted local taxing powers, limiting the district's ability to generate local funds.

GPO 919-009